BIOGRAPHICAL, LITERARY,

AND

POLITICAL

ANECDOTES,

OF SEVERAL OF

THE MOST EMINENT PERSONS

OF

THE PRESENT AGE.

NEVER BEFORE PRINTED.

WITH AN

APPENDIX;

CONSISTING OF

ORIGINAL, EXPLANATORY, AND SCARCE

PAPERS.

BY THE

AUTHOR OF ANECDOTES OF THE LATE EARL OF CHATHAM.

HISTORIAM, OMNIUM SECRETORUM MEMORIAM DICO.—*Cicero.*

IN THREE VOLUMES.

VOLUME III.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR T. N. LONGMAN, AND L. B. SEELEY, IN PATER-NOSTER-ROW.

1797.

THE

CONTENTS

OF THE

THE THIRD VOLUME.

A —— The Whig, by Junius. . . *from page* 1 to 36.
B —— Defence of Lord Chancellor Hardwicke. . . . . 36 to 52.
C —— The Country Gentleman, by the Biſhop of Oſſory. . . . . 53 to 122.
Major Cartwright's Letter. . 108.
Mr. Burke's Anſwer. . . . . 114.
D —— Papers on Sir John Dalrymple's Memoirs of Great Britain. . . 123 to 146.
E —— Letters on the Sale of Places. . . 146 to 151.
F & G —— Two Letters on the Political Conduct of Lord Mansfield, by Meſſrs. Burkes. . . . . 152 to 176.
H —— Letter on the Seizure of Papers, by Lord Temple. . . . . 177 to 195.
I —— Letter from Albemarle Street to the Cocoa Tree, by the ſame. 196 to 214.
K —— Principles of the late Changes, by the ſame. . . . . 214 to 234.
L —— Origin of Hereditary Nobility. . . 235 to 236.

M —— Account of the Duel between Mr. Whately and Mr. Temple, now Sir John Temple; with the Letters which paſſed between them, and their friends. . 236 to 273.
Dr. Franklin's Letter on that ſubject. . . . . 255.
N —— Account of the Duel between Lord George Germain and Governor Johnſtone. . . . . 274 to 278.
O —— On the management of the London Gazette, by Meſſrs. Burkes. .
Of the Duel between Lord Townſhend and Lord Bellamont. . . . 278 to 302.
P —— Sir George Savile's Letter to the Gentlemen, &c. of the County of York. . . . . 303 to 314.
Q —— Proceedings of the Chamber of Manufacturers. . . . . 314 to 361.
R —— The Yorkſhire Queſtion, by Meſſrs. Burkes. . . . . 362 to 384.
S —— Caſe of the late (Henry) Lord Holland, with the Papers. . . . 385 to 398.
T —— Mr. Burke's Speeches at Briſtol: not in his Works. . . . . 399 to 410.

ERRATA.

Vol. I. Page 17, line 14, *for* 1791, *read* 1781.
Vol. II. Page 48, line 7, *after* were, *add* not.

APPENDIX,

CONTAINING

EXPLANATORY AND SCARCE PAPERS.

[*The ſix following papers were publiſhed in one of the London morning news-papers, when Lord North was Miniſter, in the months of November and December*, 1779, *and in the months of January and March*, 1780.]

THE WHIG.

TO THE GOOD PEOPLE OF ENGLAND.

"*I will call to my Country loudly and conſtantly.*" LORD CHATHAM.

I TRUST that neither my name nor principles are obſelete; though I am aware that the name is not in ſuch reſpect, nor the principles *yet* ſo active, as at the period of the Revolution. But, if I did not feel myſelf warranted, in the hope that I addreſs a powerful body of my countrymen, when I call on my brethren of *The Good Old Cauſe*, I would not waſte my labour on a deſperate theme, nor profane the doctrine of liberty, by diſcuſſing it to unanimous ſlaves.

Whiggiſm we have ſeen triumphant in America. Whiggiſm we ſee preparing her triumph in Ireland. Let us hope, let us prove, that her ſacred flame is not extinct in England.

If a ſlave of power ſhrink from the mention of the good Old Cauſe, or, in the callous impudence of ſervitude, preſume to vilify it, I pity his wretchedneſs, I deſpiſe his inſolence; but I would puniſh his treaſon to the conſtitution.

The good Old Cauſe is the cauſe of the people. Simple and obvious is this conſideration; *that the Cauſe of the people is ſucceſsful exactly in proportion to the energy of their original power*. Such energy, acting through the claſſes of the conſtitution which the people made, preſerves their liberty as a people, and their power as a nation; for it watches integrity, and provides ability, in the perſons they permit to adminiſter their affairs. Various and intricate, on the contrary, are the means conducive to *their* cauſe, ambition, avarice, or ſloth, would enſlave, impoveriſh, or loſe their country. Rectitude has only one direction, but the obliquity of treachery is infinite.

The direction in which the people of this country act, when they act rightly, is, through the parliament which they have elected, to the throne which they have raiſed. If wickedneſs or weakneſs be found in the counſels or counſellors of the crown, parliament is the inſtrument appointed to puniſh or to diſmiſs; but if the inſtrument fail, the land will exert her native ſtrength. The people, of original right as a free people, will vindicate the country, correct their parliament,

ment, and reform their throne. I know this was not the law of Jeffries, I know it is not the law of modern Weſtminſter; but I know it is the right reaſon of the conſtitution. I would not violate the manes of the Revolution, by quoting Locke againſt Lord Mansfield, even if it were a queſtion of argument; but human authority or reaſoning, however illuſtrious or forcible, were ſuperfluous to demonſtrate what God hath written in our hearts.

Public guilt being capable of ſuch diverſification, it is evidently the duty of public virtue to exerciſe various attention to the ſeveral aſſaults that may be made by power, and will be ever made in ſome degree, againſt the intereſts of the community. Innumerable are the modes in which hypocriſy may deceive, tyranny oppreſs, corruption debauch, or negligence ſquander; any one of which crimes, unchecked, would run to general ruin. But if, in monſtrous and unheard-of conſpiracy, they ſhould all unite againſt the liberty and glory of a country, throughout all the betrayed truſts of the public; active indeed ought to be the exertion of the people againſt ſuch danger. The Whig ſpirit exiſting in the country muſt collect and co-operate. If compreſſed in ſmall compaſs, its ſpring will be the ſtronger. The public traitor may inſult falling Liberty with the reproach that

all her ſpirit is extinguiſhed; that no public virtue remains; that every man is baſe and wicked as himſelf; but the reproach will operate as it ought. It will give vigour to ſtrength, and activity to reſentment. It will ſharpen public ſpirit, and point the virtue of the patriot with the honour of the man.

Vigilance ſhould be in proportion to danger. If we have been remiſs, and if public danger have, in conſequence, encreaſed, let us now double our watch, and redeem our negligence.

In England every man is a politician.—This maxim hath incurred ridicule, only from the imperfection of its obſervance. It is exactly conſtitutional, and ſtrictly true in theory; but it becomes ridiculous, becauſe it is only theoretical. It ought to be demonſtrated in practice; and then it would not be anſwered with a laugh. "The Britiſh Conſtitution, Lord Bolingbroke well ſays, is the *buſineſs* of every Briton."

The Britiſh Conſtitution hath changed its form, and is loſing its ſpirit. Some magic has metamorphoſed the ancient pyramid into the deformity of a Chineſe Pagoda. The beautiful ſtrength of its order is gone; and we now tremble for the narrowed baſe; oppreſſed by the middle; with monſters at the top!

How to recal the ſpirit that hath fled, and how to raiſe that which remains; how to reſtore

reſtore external ſtability, and by what beſt means to purify into its ancient vigour the interior of the conſtitution, is the *buſineſs* which now demands the active vigilance of all—for the danger is univerſal and imminent.

As a member of the public body, I offer to my country all my exertion towards the public weal, in the humble but laborious office which I undertake. It is humble; for it profeſſes little more than the repreſentation of fact. It will be laborious; for the endeavour will be to repreſent the miſchiefs of the times.

It is not eaſy to ſelect from multiplicity; but in guarding againſt dangers, *foreign* and *domeſtic*, the conduct of their Repreſentatives in Parliament ſeems to challenge the firſt and inſtant attention of the people: for it is the malignity of this enormous miſchief, like ſkepticiſm in religion, that it fights the forms againſt the ſubſtance. Faith is above reaſon; and the people are paramount to their ſervants: but the infidel blaſphemes in very regular ſyllogiſms; and the Miniſter betrays his country exactly according to *order*, and with perfect preſervation of every form of Parliament. Of this, the public ſhall have damning proof;—irrefragable proof;—undeniable—except by Lord North,—for it ſhall be the proof of FACT.

November, 1779.

THE

THE WHIG.

The King can do no wrong.

WHEN a Prince of the Houſe of Hanover wears the crown of Great-Britain, the WHIG is not aſhamed to confeſs his prejudice. He would preſume, from the former Princes and principles of that Houſe, to the preſent; and his predilection is anxious to believe, in the full extent of the maxim, perſonal as as well political, *that the King can do no wrong.*

But when a monarch in this country, ſprung from whatever line, adorned with whatever hopes from the glories of his anceſtry, or his own original virtues, perſiſts in counſels that do grievous wrong, and threaten inſtant ruin; affection is loſt in duty. Duty to the country demands diſcuſſion of a maxim, which, if the conſtruction of the court were permitted, would ſanctify every public crime, and eſtabliſh public calamity. Duty to the Prince, as part of the conſtitution formed by the people, enjoins conſtitutional explanation to him of a phraſe, which flattery has rendered fatal to tyrants.

When it is truly ſaid, that the King can do no wrong, the office is intended and not the

the perſon; and this true conſtruction is the perfect praiſe of our admirable conſtitution. The King of England can do no wrong; for it is not the office of the King *to do* any thing. The cautious wiſdom of our policy will not permit the King to act. It not only ſuppoſes, but requires, that ability ſhall be ſelected from the people to execute the active duties of the ſtate. Even in the ſelection of ſuch active ability for public ſervice, the King, as we are now conſidering him, cannot do wrong. For the conſideration ſuppoſes him in his conſtitutional public character; a character conferred on him conditionally by the people. The condition of his royalty is a wiſe and honeſt adminiſtration of the ſtate. It is impoſſible, therefore, in conſtitutional contemplation, that a *King of England* ſhould appoint incapable or unworthy men to adminiſter public affairs; or, if appointed, that the *people of England* ſhould permit them to be retained; that a free people ſhould ſacrifice their original rights and conſtitutive power to ſuch abuſe of the kingly office. The unfairneſs of arguing from ſuch abuſe is evident. The kingly office ſo abuſed would no longer belong to the conſtitution. It is a monſtrous caſe, and out of the ſuppoſition of fair reaſoning.

Such being the genuine ſenſe of the maxim, the corollary obſervation that is formed upon it

it appears equally juſt and neceſſary; that the Miniſters of executive power are reſponſible to the people: and their reſponſibility was formerly through the medium of parliament.

The office of King being thus conſidered, I truſt with due reſpect; for I think it receives the higheſt when defined as part of the conſtitution; it remains to remind the perſon appointed to that office, that he is a man;—that in his perſonal capacity he may, he muſt *do wrong*; for error is eſſential to humanity. It remains to remonſtrate to him, that whoever confounds his perſon with his office, is a fatal enemy to both; for that they are ſo perfectly diſtinct in their nature, attributes, and intereſts, that the abuſe of the one is expiable only by the puniſhment of the other. The conſtitution will not admit that *the King* did wrong; and the law ſays, that *the King* never dies: but *Charles Stuart* was an obſtinate tyrant; and *Charles Stuart* loſt his head.

No more then let a maxim, founded in the very bottom of our conſtitutional liberty, be forced to a conſtruction which would ſhake and endanger it. No longer let the law of the conſtitution which would preſerve ſacred the office of the King, be perverted to the deſtruction of the man.

Another tenet of court-craft, new in the politics

politics of this country, is not leſs dangerous to its profeſſors than the perverſion of the royal maxim that has been conſidered. As kings believed they could not individually do wrong, miniſters now flatter themſelves that *majorities in Parliament can make wrong right*; and from them they hope, not only their own exculpation, but perfect eſtabliſhment of their arbitrary ſyſtem.

It will not be difficult to demonſtrate the folly, as well as the wickedneſs, of ſuch a principle; and to prove, to the utter deſpair of arbitrary men, that the ſeeds of *revolution* have been more immediately ſown, and with more certainty of inſtant growth and effect, by the Miniſters of the preſent King, than by any inſtruments of tyranny in former times.

The poſition which I maintain, and ſhall prove, in direct contradiction to their parliamentary confidence, is this; *that majorities in Parliament are certainly ruinous to the Sovereign and his Miniſters, in proportion to the ſupport they are induced to give them, in perſiſting againſt the ſenſe of the people.*

I ſhall, in my next paper, conſider the fact, as it has occurred in America and Ireland; and then, if *our* Whig-ſpirit be not extinct, and if ſimilar cauſes produce ſimilar effects, *let the executive power tremble in Great-Britain.*

December, 1779.

THE

THE WHIG.

This glorious ſpirit of WHIGGISM, *animates millions in America, who prefer poverty with liberty to gilded chains and ſordid affluence; and will die in defence of their rights as men, —as freemen,——What ſhall reſiſt this ſpirit? ——Ireland they have to a man.*

Jan. 20, 1775. LORD CHATHAM.

HOWEVER congenial his mind to the ſpirit triumphant in a neighbouring kingdom, emulous of the glories as ſhe was participant in the injuries of the weſtern empire, grievous yet is the pang which every lover of his country feels in this degraded iſland. For the triumph of Liberty is now the diſgrace of England. America is victorious and free. Ireland, without the trouble of victory, enjoys all its conſequence and glory. She diſplays the banner of independence; her armies appear; and England ſurrenders at diſcretion.

England, the arbitreſs of empire,—England, the diſpenſer of the power and guardian of the rights of nations;—England, the wonder and terror of the world—what art thou now! Diſabled, diſhonoured, fallen; deſperate of aſſiſtance from friends, for you have none;

or

or of ſucceſs againſt enemies, for you failed when you were ſtronger, againſt adverſaries leſs numerous or powerful:—too little for conſideration in a ſcale of the balance which you once held and adjuſted; and remembered only in the ridicule of Europe: vanquiſhed by your Colonies, to whom you ſued in vain for mercy; and ſubdued even by the aſpect of Ireland, to her abſolute command.

Love of our country cannot be extinguiſhed in the hearts of Engliſhmen; and care of what we love compels us to ſave it from utter deſtruction. Though the ſenſe of glory were dead throughout the people, yet, if the common and firſt principles of nature, ſelf-defence, and ſelf-preſervation, be not extinct among them, the period of revolution and revenge is at hand. The public ſenſe was dull to the diſtant miſchief; but preſent calamity ſtrikes ſtrongly and ſuddenly.—Three months nurſed the American lie; but the Miniſter cannot falſify Ireland. Three days detect him, and demonſtrate the glories of that country and the diſgrace of this;——her independence and our ſubmiſſion. We feel her torn from our ſide, and we bleed at every vein.

Such feeling is too poignant for patience. It rouſes to action every remaining nerve of our ſtrength, to reſcue from inſtant loſs the little that is left;—to preſerve domeſtic ſecurity,

rity, though we have thrown away empire; to entruſt the ſacred relick to hearts that know its value, and hands that can defend it; and, above all, piouſly to perform the rites of the conſtitution: appeaſing, by exemplary juſtice, the indignant manes of our power and our glory.

But in this neceſſary courſe of national juſtice, much difficulty is to be encountered from the generous prejudices of Engliſhmen. In favour of Miniſters? No man will imagine it, in a reign, which has rendered ſynonimous the odium of the country and the favour of the crown. The fate of ſuch favourites as have never before ſtained the annals of any reign in any country, will be unparalleled in hiſtory. Unqualified by any ſentiment of reſpect for talents, admiration of magnanimity, or pity of any one virtue, the public execration that ſpares them not in their power, will overwhelm them in their fall;—the contempt that purſues them now will inſpire peculiar indignation then, that ſuch uſurpers of power ſhould have been enabled and permitted ſo to fall;—with the blind deſpair, but without the ſtrength of the ſtrong man, ſo to drag into ruin the mighty fabric of the Britiſh empire.

But difficulties of an high and delicate nature will ariſe in effecting the revolution of our liberties. They have ariſen elſewhere;

but the neceſſity of the commonwealth has ſurmounted them. Founded, however, in the generoſities of ancient attachment, I know they are found in the heart of every Engliſhman.

Eighteen years of tory-rule cannot have entirely detached THE WHIGS of England from the houſe of Hanover. The memory of an illuſtrious anceſtry, and gratitude to their virtues, muſt qualify reſentment of preſent wrongs, with an affectionate kind of ſorrow; and ſorrow, in generous minds, ſoon grows to pity. Crimes then are loſt in miſfortunes; or if remembered, we wiſh to reclaim rather than to puniſh. Or even, if obſtinacy be irreclaimable, we have ſtill ſome hope in the future, from our knowledge of the paſt. A diſhonoured reign may paſs away in our annals, like a cloudy day in ſummer; and if the day be not too long, nor the tempeſt too violent, the glories of the ſucceeding morning may anſwer our hopes and renew our happineſs.

But to tranquiliſe, if poſſible, the preſent ſcene, by reconciling our affection to a particular family, with our duty to the country, let us endeavour to win attention before we force it. Let us convince by reaſon rather than by power; and try to prevent the miſchief by the example of others, rather than correct it by our own.

It

It was propoſed in my laſt paper to conſider the fact of diſunion from this country, as it has occurred in America and Ireland, in demonſtration of the maxim that I there advanced againſt the parliamentary confidence of arbitrary men. From the fatal example of thoſe countries, I undertook to prove, *that majorities in parliament are ruinous to the Sovereign and his Miniſters, in proportion to the ſupport they are induced to give them againſt the ſenſe of the people.*

In America the people were unanimous againſt certain powers claimed by their late king, and attempted to be exerciſed by his miniſters: but the monarch perſiſted againſt his people; and has loſt his American throne. So far the fact ſtands undiſputed. Now let us conſider whether his miniſters and their majorities in parliament have not affected the ruin of his royalty, while they flattered his ambition, and ſeemed to ſupport his power.

It is beyond any common calculation of obſtinacy, that the American war would have been perſiſted in, if the monarch had not been infatuated by thoſe monſtrous majorities which his miniſters, by every monſtrous means, procured in parliament. I ſay, by every monſtrous means: for beſides the court-corruption that prevails in all caſes, new and unheard-of wickedneſs prevailed in this. Falſification

ſification of fact was not indeed new in the miniſter; but in the magnitude of this inſtance, it took peculiar criminality. Suppreſſion of every truth, univerſal fraud, and baſeſt miſrepreſentation, blinded the reaſon of men; while every ſeductive and inflammatory art perverted and poiſoned their paſſions. Without ſuch impulſe, no monarch, however blind or obſtinate, would have perſiſted in ſuch a war; without ſuch ſupport, he could not have drawn the ſword from year to year againſt his people.

But even if ſuch had been the ſituation; if without the fiction of parliamentary ſanction, the royal ſtandard had been erected againſt the liberties of America, he could not have loſt his American Crown more abſolutely than he has by act of parliament. I believe he would not have loſt it ſo certainly. America would have conquered the King, and more ſpeedily perhaps than ſhe conquered the King and Parliament; but her magnanimity might have forgotten the idle ambition of a fooliſh Prince; though ſhe will never forgive, in prudence or in ſpirit, the formal tyranny of a grave Legiſlature.

My reader may have been ſurprized and ſhocked, when I aſſerted the fact of Ireland being now diſunited from this country; becauſe he may have liſtened to the tales of Miniſters, and the impudent inventions of their

their advocates. But I aſſert again and again, that Ireland is at this moment in an actual ſtate of diſunion from us; diſunion of commerce, diſunion of finance, diſunion of military ſtrength, and diſunion of national affection. Such is the fact; and therefore I expect to hear the Miniſter aſſure Parliament of the contrary.

If Parliament continue any faith in the wiſdom or truth of the man, whoſe folly and fallacies miſled them to caſt America from us, the preſent diſunion of Ireland, which their marked ſervility to him at the cloſe of laſt Seſſion has already produced, and their prepoſterous ſupport of him at the beginning of this has already ſtrongly confirmed, will be ratified for ever. I ſtate the fact of their reſentment, without now going into the diſcuſſion of their wrongs: but their reſentment is expreſsly and pointedly againſt the Britiſh Parliament. They exhauſt all their eloquence againſt it in their debates; and when they want terms to expreſs its tyranny, its avarice, its inſenſibility to every thing honourable or juſt, they ſay that the Britiſh Parliament and the Britiſh Miniſter are ſynonimous.

December, 1779.

THE

THE WHIG.

To the Right Honourable EDWARD *Lord Baron* THURLOW, *and Lord High Chancellor of England.*

MAGNUM *virum facile dixeris*; BONUM *libenter.*

I Have acknowledged your rank, my Lord, and your high titles, with the pleaſure that every liberal mind feels in doing juſtice to an eminent character. Every man is ready to confeſs that they have been earned by abilities as ſuperior, as the independence and honour ought to be, which alone can dignify their nature or juſtify their tenure. But there, my Lord, on that cardinal point, the public judgment has been long ſuſpended. If I add that the ſcale is now rapidly deſcending againſt you, and that the wonder of your talents avails only to give weight and acceleration to the cenſure of your conduct, your Lordſhip will confeſs the juſtice of your country, when you recollect yourſelf, and look round on the men whoſe cauſe you condeſcend to plead.

One of that public who delighted in admiring,

miring, and who now exerciſe with pain their right of judging you, I yet offer myſelf to your Lordſhip as your friend. And though the friendſhip of honeſt reproof be in general equally thankleſs and fruitleſs, I rely on the manlineſs of your mind for its public effect in this inſtance, and even for your Lordſhip's gratitude.

Before our correſpondence proceeds, let me clear its way to your underſtanding and your approbation.

This letter is written, and unleſs rendered unneceſſary, more ſhall be addreſſed to your Lordſhip, not as a public man who influences public affairs, but as the Dictator of the State who decides them; I do not ſay immediately in council, but certainly in effect. Your Lordſhip already underſtands me, and ſo will the people before our correſpondence cloſes. In the mean time I ſtate myſelf to your Lordſhip and my country, not alone juſtified but impelled to repreſent you to yourſelf and explain you to the public, in all your preſent power and all its fatal conſequence; impelled, by what your own nervous eloquence too conſciouſly deſcribes, "the abundant danger and exigence of the time."

I do not argue unfairly with your Lordſhip, when I aſſume the fact of our miſgovernment for the laſt ten years. *I know* the

the contempt with which the ſuperiority of your mind has looked down to the wretchedneſs of the adminiſtration.

I admire the emphatic zeal for your own dignity with which you have ever diſclaimed all fellowſhip, even perſonal acquaintance*, with the Prime Miniſter. And it was in theſe ſentiments that I hoped, and the public expected, my Lord, you would have diſdained all continuance of public connection with him. A man of ſpirit, it was concluded that you would not devote yourſelf for ever to puſillanimity and diſhonour; a man of activity and vigour, it was deemed impoſſible that you ſhould be rivetted to indolence and lethargy, and that the only exertion of your great talents ſhould be in defence of ignorance and inſenſibility, which they had attempted in vain to inform and animate.

Such, my Lord, was the perſuaſion of a people who were willing to confide at leaſt in your magnanimity: and even yet it is hoped that you will not thwart your nature, becauſe

* Lord Thurlow has taken many opportunities of vindicating himſelf on this ſubject. "I have no habits with the Miniſter"—"I do not know Lord North,"—are his expreſſions *(verbatim)* on thoſe occaſions. But, in a more public ſcene, his determined ſilence on Lord North's *character*, is ſtill more deciſive. He cannot, indeed, reſcue him from the eloquence of Lord Shelburne; but it is the very malice of contempt to leave him to the praiſes of Lord Hillſborough, and the Duke of Chandos.

it happens to concur with your duty;—that the natural exertion of your character will not be weakened, from the conſideration that it would ſave your country.

It is not my preſent purpoſe, my Lord, to write the hiſtory of Mr. Thurlow; for my object is purely public. Totally, therefore, rejecting every *private* anecdote, let us contemplate your preſent public capacity. If turning the teleſcope for a moment, I deſcry, through the diſtant and diminiſhed retroſpect, an accidental advocate at a country quarter ſeſſions, it is only to prepare my mind with due wonder for the contraſt of your preſent magnitude. If I recollect the firſt fortuitous ſtep to the houſe of Queenſbury, it is to admire—ſincerely, Sir, to admire,—the ſtrides of your genius, mounting now above the Houſe of Bedford. The inferiorities of the portrait are beneath the public intereſt and the public eye. *Ex* CAPITE *Herculem.*

At the opening of this ſeſſion, the general ſtate of the kingdom, and the empire, became, as uſual, the ſubject of parliamentary conſideration. The particular topics ſince ſelected for eſpecial diſcuſſion have been the conduct of our Miniſters, with reſpect to the kingdom of Ireland, and their management in regard to the public finance.

In all theſe great conſiderations and diſcuſſions, you have ſtood forth the only champion

champion of the preſent Miniſters. For of their own defences, I would in decency ſay nothing. Beſides their being the culprits; and diſentitled to any credit in their aſſertion, its meanneſs were ſufficient to diſguſt us and condemn them. Accuſe them of public crime, of the danger of our iſlands, or the loſs of our territory; they declare, with the moſt ridiculous ſolemnity, that it is not the fault *of thoſe who conduct public affairs as they are*, but *of thoſe who labour to make them otherwiſe*. For their own part, they call God to witneſs, *they know nothing of the matter**. Demonſtrate their public peculation;—they deprecate juſtice in the ſame ſpirit of the Old Bailey; in the very language, indeed, of a profligate convict:—*We have robbed the public, but we have ſquandered the ſpoil;—don't puniſh us, for we ſhall not be able to maintain our families*†.

I aſk pardon from my reader for deſcending to ſuch miſery; rendered worthy of public notice, only from your ſingular ſupport. No Nobleman, except your Lordſhip, has ſtooped to it; no Engliſhman, except yourſelf, has ſo inſulted his country. Even in

* Lord North *(verbatim)* on the ſtate of Ireland, and the Jamaica papers; and Lord Stormont, on every ſubject; eſpecially the *American* queſtion, "For he was Embaſſador at Paris."

† Lord Hillſborough *(verbatim)* in the Houſe of Lords.

the

the Houſe of Commons, none but Scotch Lawyers were found hardy enough on that day to inſult this kingdom. And even they, with all the ſervility of their country, and venality of their profeſſion (Mr. Adam indeed is but a young practitioner) were forced to confeſs "the *ſluggiſhneſs* of Lord North." They did not poſt from Scotland to applaud the Miniſter, whoſe irreſolution has renewed rebellion in their kirk, and whoſe continued power will add depopulation and famine to their country. No, my Lord, they are too diſcreet. They croſſed the Tweed, according to the diſtinction ſuggeſted by their countryman, and pretty ſteadily adopted ſince, not to defend *Miniſters*, but to ſupport *Government*. —And the doctrine is now eſtabliſhed in practice, by an immediate proficient from Lord Mansfield's ſchool;—*that the only mode of ſupporting Government is to ſlander the people*; to demonſtrate that we have neither virtue, talents, or ſpirit among us; that we ought therefore to endure defeat and diſgrace, as our neceſſary lot, and hew our wood and draw our water without repining.

The excluſive infamy of ſuch auxiliaries were itſelf ſufficient to drag down the dignity of any character. Firmer fame even than yours, if it riſqued ſuch ruin, could not eſcape it. When the Lord High Chancellor of England deſcends from his preſiding ſeat in

in the aſſembly of the nobles, to mix with impudent mercenaries in a cauſe which every man of honour ſhrinks from, he forfeits every reputation, and his glory will ſet more rapidly than it roſe. *Deſcent and fall*, which, with the ſpirits of Milton, we thought *adverſe*, at leaſt to the magnanimity of his character, will grow natural, neceſſary, and inſtant, to its abaſement. He ſinks for ever.

January, 1780.

THE WHIG.

Alas, from what high hope, to what relapſe
Unlooked for, are we fall'n!

THE facts which have long tended and now combine to give perfection to the arbitrary influence of the crown, may be diſtinguiſhed into two claſſes: the *ancient opportunities of abuſe in government*, unremoved by an imperfect revolution; and, *the modern inventions of power*. It ought not to be wondered at, that the former, which eſcaped the wreck of James's tyranny, ſurvived ſafe and forgotten through the glorious and happy reigns that followed. But it is as much to be lamented, as it is ſenſibly felt, that dor-

mant as they ſeemed to have been in the reigns of popular Princes, they were, in fact, acquiring ſize and ſtrength, ſufficient to arm the hand of modern power with inſtruments more dangerous to liberty, than the coarſer times of James or Charles had furniſhed. Thoſe opportunities, and temptations to deſpotiſm, ſeem to have attained their full maturity at the commencement of the preſent reign. The ſeptennial act of ſuicide, abhorrent certainly from the popular nature of parliament, and deſtructive of its due independence on the crown, had been long perpetrated. Military power and civil influence united to enable the Prince, if he were ſo diſpoſed by nature or education, to oppreſs and corrupt the people, whoſe property and power was leſſened, exactly in the proportion that the crown had gained weight and force, by the eſtabliſhment of a ſtanding army and a national debt. But, above all, the time of his aſcenſion to the throne was full of ſuch peculiar circumſtances of popularity, as gave him unlimited, becauſe unſuſpected, power. Into that auſpicious moment was crouded all the promiſe of his youth; founded in the fond memory of all the virtues of his anceſtors; of his youth, riſing, as it ſeemed, to renew the race of glory that they had run, even up to the recent goal of univerſal conqueſt. Nature and fortune conſpired to give

the young Monarch of that day an empire the beſt and moſt permanent that Monarchs can enjoy, if they wiſh to maintain it,—an abſolute power in the hearts of his ſubjects.

Such was the power and the opportunity of exerciſing it with which his preſent Majeſty aſcended the throne. If it had been the counſel of his reign to improve it into the perfect and reciprocal happineſs of himſelf and his people, the way was not ſteep nor difficult. The virtues of his royal grandfather, the talents of Mr. Pitt, and the genius of England, called into action by them, had ſurmounted the difficulties of war and faction, and corruption; and nothing remained for a Prince that wiſhed an honourable and happy reign, but to purſue the path that his anceſtor had trod, with new facility and aſcertained ſucceſs.

But if other counſels were introduced, and other objects propoſed than the mutual intereſts of prince and people, different then muſt have been the means to attain thoſe different ends. Then, inſtead of cultivating the ſalutary fruits of wiſe and happy government, the old weeds of tyranny would be carefully cheriſhed and diſſeminated, till a new harveſt ſhould ariſe, adapted to the ſeaſon, and to the taſtes of men, leſs loathſome, but more poiſonous and fatal. The unextirpated abuſes of former times, mellowed

lowed now by age, would be refined into a new and more ſubtil ſpirit. Then would appear, in ſuperaddition to the ancient opportunities of miſgovernment, unremoved by the old Revolution, *the modern inventions of power*, to be removed and annihilated only by a new one.

I will not ſay that the counſels early inculcated into the mind of the young Prince, and the young King, were other than doctrines of the pureſt liberty; for I never heard the conſtitutional lectures, which Lord Bute delivered in the cloſet. But every Engliſhman will aſſert what he feels, while freedom of ſpeech and ſenſe of feeling remain to him; that whatever thoſe principles were, the effect of them has been extenſion of royal influence, and violation of popular rights: and every man of common ſenſe will conclude in argument, that as falſehood cannot flow from truth, ſo the political effect that has been ſtated as generally felt, cannot be the reſult of the moſt perfect conſtitutional principles.

The diſtinguiſhing characteriſtic of the preſent reign ſeems to be the new ſpirit in which the Members of Adminiſtration muſt ſeverally live, move, and have their being. Formerly, Adminiſtration was a body actuated by one ſpirit that pervaded the whole; its members were diſtinct, not ſeparate: the

particular

particular function of each was enforced by the correſponding authority of all; and the general object was compaſſed by conſent of parts, giving the additional effort, as nature and reaſon dictate, of united force. Now, our mangled government is in a perpetual ſtate of ſeveralty and diſunion; and, like the Polypus, each wretched part crawls about without power, name, or ſignificance.

But weakneſs alone were not a ſufficient qualification for a modern miniſter. He muſt be actively contemptible, if he expect honour at court. So conſtant encouragement is extended, and always a ready audience to all the little ſlander of office againſt office; to the whiſper of the Treaſury againſt the American department, or to the lye of the Admiralty againſt them both. Occaſions are ſtudiouſly contrived to bend and ſubdue the ſpirits of men; and thoſe are advanced the higheſt in the ſervice, who have beſt learned the diſcipline of diſgrace. There ſhould be little wonder, that commanders in ſuch a ſervice are ſought for from the ranks.

Virtue, we are told by an admired authority, is the principle of government in republics; and honour, in a monarchy. In a government, therefore, ſuppoſed to unite, and almoſt to identify the properties of both; where the power of the monarch is the conſent of the people, and popular concurrence

is regal ſtrength; we might hope for the combined principle of honourable virtue. But if, in fact directly contrary, we find a principle that counterplots and counterworks the beſt and nobleſt affections of humanity, and would annihilate all moral duty and natural connexion; a principle that ſevers friend from friend, and ſeduces brother from brother; that hugs and betrays and deſtroys; that drives honour to deſpair, and leaves no alternative to virtue, but infamy or ſuicide; it will not be a very unlogical or uncharitable concluſion to infer, that ſuch a government is neither in the ſpirit of a republic or a monarchy; that ſuch a principle cannot be ſuppoſed to be enforced in mere wantonneſs, and without an object; for vice is not its own reward; and, therefore, that deſpotiſm alone is the ſpirit of that government, where ſuch principles and practices prevail.

Beſides the ſeparate and diſhonoured capacity in which modern politics require Miniſters to depend, not on their viriues or talents, not on popular favour or honourable connexion, but on *ſomething elſe* directly oppoſite; towards perfectly eſtabliſhing the new ſyſtem on the ruins of the old, particular innovation of diſgrace was neceſſary in that department of adminiſtration, which the courteſy and the ſucceſs of former times had denominated *the firſt*. The Prime Miniſter was now to be

be the prime object of contempt. Inſtead of the dignified and official conſequence in Parliament, which naturally and conſtitutionally would attend a Miniſter of ſpirited talents and popular virtues; our *novus homo* muſt ſubmit to the new penance of his place: deriving no honour from victory, for every man was to know him only as the Adjutant of the troops; but leſt he ſhould imagine himſelf more, or grow by miſtake into any reputation, he was ſtudiouſly to be expoſed in ſituations of diſgrace and diſappointment: in contemptible minorities, without a friend to ſupport or pity him: (I ſpeak of former occaſions, when the court power was ſupreme; for *now* the management of parliament is not quite ſo optional to the ſpirit of St. James's:) ſo that when the parliamentary Minſter ſeemed to ſail on the full tide of power "to bring America to his feet," whether by Scoth bills of *ſtarvation*, or *his own* conciliatory propoſitions, he was to find himſelf carried away by ſome under-current, out of his latitude and contrary to his reckoning. Real pay indeed was to compenſate the futility of nominal rank; but the private favour was precarious, and the public odium certain. He was to be the Miniſter or the Meſſenger, as the arbitrary whim of the minute ſhould dictate or permit; to have authority enough to effectuate every miſchief that

that ſhould be commanded, but no power whatever, if by chance he ſhould be inclined to prevent any; juſtly reſponſible for others crimes as well as his own, becauſe their willing inſtrument; the devoted victim of their ambition and his own meanneſs: he was, in fine, to repreſent *the pawn* before the perſon of *the King*; advanced and protected for a time; but when no longer able to divert or ſuſtain the attack, to be ſwept away from the board for ever, the *enfans perdu* of a deſperate party.

March, 1780.

THE WHIG.

——*his own Miniſter.*

WHEN the planters and merchants of Jamaica demanded from the firſt Lord of the Admiralty ſome aſſurance of protection from the fleet of England, Lord Sandwich informed them, "that his was merely an *executive* department." When they waited on the Secretary of State for America, to ſolicit ſome attention from government, Lord George Germain acquainted them, "that every thing had been done that *he* could do." When they called upon the Prime Miniſter for ſome exertion to ſave the iſland, Lord North

North told them, "he did not know it was in danger; but if it were, *he* could undertake nothing poſitive for its defence: that Lord Sandwich was perfectly right in his politics; for that the firſt Lord of the Admiralty, the Secretaries of State, and firſt Lord of the Treaſury, were merely *executive: the cabinet muſt determine.*"

Omitting for the preſent the characteriſtic conduct of theſe noble perſons on that occaſion; the inſolent levity, the hollow politeneſs, and the laboured nothingneſs; I deſire to faſten my reader's attention to the ſingularity of this ſubject. It is the only article of political communion among the Miniſters. In no one ſentiment of politics do they agree but this, to diſſemble their reſpective reſponſibility, and to load their common maſter with the guilt of all his ſervants:—you cannot ſay *that I did it: the King is his own Miniſter.*"

If it were poſſible to add to the guilt of men who have plundered the property, and openly aſſail the liberty of the people, this additional contempt of the conſtitution of their country would crown their crimes. It is notorious, that they have recourſe to it on every criminal and penal part of their conduct or their neglect. It is their conſtant boaſt of impunity. I enquire not whether ſuch a libel on the government of England—a libel

ſo

ſo *falſe*, my Lord Mansfield, and ſo ſeditious in neceſſary conſequence againſt his crown and dignity, be ſtamped with the royal *imprimatur*; or whether, as I wiſh may be the fact, it be the forgery of the men who have ſurrounded and betrayed him. They are the publiſhers, if they did not invent or dictate it; and they will ſoon be tried by God and their country.

In this ſhort ſentence is wound up and compreſſed all the myſtery and miſchief of modern politics. *The King is his own Miniſter.* That is, the whole executive power and adminiſtration of the State is to be placed in hands ſuperior to controul; too ſtrong for ordinary reſiſtance, and too ſacred as is ſuppoſed for puniſhment. In effect, therefore, whenever people can be ſubdued to the practice of ſuch theory, this principle amounts to perfect and complete deſpotiſm. For what is the power of the moſt arbitrary deſpot on earth, other than poſſeſſion of the whole executive ſtrength of the State without check of reſiſtance, or fear of puniſhment? —What truer deſcription can apply to an arbitrary Monarch, than that he is the uncontrolled Miniſter of his own ambition and caprice, in the unjuſt violences of war, and the corruptions and follies of internal government?

I had occaſion in an early paper to diſcuſs the

the trite and miſunderſtood maxim in the polity of England, *that the King can do no wrong*. While the Engliſh conſtitution is preſerved, it is in its true ſenſe a wiſe and uſeful maxim; but if the monſtrous innovation were tolerated, *that the King is his own Miniſter*, it becomes nonſenſe or tyranny. If he makes no uſe whatever of his miniſterial power, it is abſurd to call him his own miniſter, as it would be ſuperfluous to ſay that he can do no wrong who does nothing. But if he exert the executive power, perſonally inveſted in him by this tyrannous doctrine, and if that exertion be unpuniſhable and unqueſtionable *becauſe he can do no wrong*, I know no more complete deſcription of arbitrary ſway.

The old Utopia of the controlling care of Parliament, of the grand inqueſt of the nation, and the hereditary council of the crown, is very pretty reading, and it is no more. We may amuſe ourſelves with looking at theſe venerable family-pictures of the conſtitution, the works certainly of eminent maſters, and admire the unfading colours of their fame. But are they more than objects of curioſity, or, at beſt, of empty admiration, out of all modern taſte and reſemblance? In the portrait of Godolphin do we trace the features of Lord North? Was Somers the prototype of the Earl of Mansfield? Is the

preſent uſurper of Blenheim, a Duke of Marlborough?

In truth, whoever would now go about to talk of whig-principles in government; inſpired and eſtabliſhed by the honour of the peers or the virtue of the commons, muſt be a more impudent knave than the majority of either houſe can produce. To prove that the ſun ſhines at midnight is a difficulty too arduous even for "the forehead" (as he himſelf *modeſtly* expreſſes it,) of the Earl of Sandwich. A more practicable and more wicked courſe is purſued. It were deſperate to appeal to the reaſon of mankind againſt their ſenſes; but appeals to their malignity againſt their reaſon may be attended with ſucceſs. Thus the few advocates who can be induced to plead in ſuch a cauſe, never ſhock the common ſenſe of their audience by endeavouring to prove their friends able or honeſt: they think it decent, and perhaps they have hitherto found it politic, to argue that all other men are equally deſtitute of talents and virtue. This infamous language, chaſtiſed as it has been in parliament by eloquence and refuted by example, would little deſerve the revival of public indignation; if it were not one of the immediate tenets of that ſchiſmatick hereſy in politicks, *that the King is his own Miniſter*. All popularity of character, and honourable connexion, whether of nobles

in a ſtate, or of thoſe talents and patriot virtues which conſtitute true nobility, are eternal bars in the way of the arbitrary ſyſtem which, it has been proved, muſt reſult from that favourite principle. The early excluſion of Mr. Pitt and introduction of the Earl of Bute, were the firſt bitter waters of that fatal fountain which has almoſt deluged the rights and power of the people. The early and continued ſpirit of ſlander againſt every thing virtuous and honourable, firſt went forth from the new cabinet againſt that great and popular man: becauſe his greatneſs and popularity ſtood in the way of the new principle, *that the King was to be his own Miniſter.* The perſecution and proſcription from royal favour of the Whig families and connexions of England, has been uniform; unleſs in one or two exceptions, the ſhort period of which has only ſerved to prove the rule, that Whig principles are inconſiſtent with the new Toryiſm, *that the King is his own Miniſter.*

It is neceſſary for the people of England, riſing as they now are with yeoman-virtue throughout the country, in vindication of their ancient rights in their property and liberty, to beware of the full extent of this malignant principle. In its full extent, it ſubverts every ſecurity of public liberty, while the forms of the conſtitution remain. If the King be his own Miniſter, and if thoſe who

fill the offices of ſtate be, as Lord Sandwich and Lord North affirm, merely *executive*; all due and regular reſponſibility is loſt. Thirteen provinces and the fleet of England may be ſold to France; the people muſt ſubmit to poverty, and hug their eternal chains; for no change of counſel can recover their empire, their power, or their liberty. They can infuſe no popular ſupport, nor popular ſucceſs in conſequence, into a new Adminiſtration;—for, *the King is his own Miniſter*. *Obſtinate* adherence, therefore, to ſuch a principle, induces the inevitable alternative of ſlavery in the people, or the perſonal reſponſibility of Majeſty. The latter has a precedent in our hiſtory; the former has no example.

March, 1780.

To the Printer of the Public Advertiſer.

I Have lately read a bulky performance, which profeſſes to diſcuſs many law points of great importance. It is entitled "A Letter on Libels, Warrants, &c."

What ſtopped me firſt in reading, and ſhall alone engage my animadverſion now, is a long paſſage early in the book, in which the author goes wantonly out of his way, without the leaſt call from his argument, merely

merely to introduce his character of a very great perſon, who is only not named, who is but lately dead, and whoſe memory will be ever dear, not only to all that knew him perſonally, but to all honeſt and good men of whatever denomination.

In this character ſome few commendations are affectedly introduced; but the particular cenſures, which make the much greater part of the paſſage, are ſo utterly inconſiſtent with thoſe few and ſparing praiſes, that it is no breach of candor and charity to ſuppoſe, that the former praiſes were inſerted only to point the cenſures which follow with a more malignant rancour.

The great perſon alluded to is here pronounced to have approached nearer, in his political and legal conduct, and in every other reſpect indeed, to the Earl of Clarendon than to Lord Somers:—and what then? It is always invidious to compare characters, and would be impertinent and ungenerous to raiſe a monument to the fame of either of thoſe great men on the ruin of others. The world is now agreed in acknowledging the abilities and merit of both; but it is well known to all, who were acquainted with this noble perſon, that he conſtantly made Lord Somers his firſt and avowed model; and that this eminent Stateſman, with the Lord Chief Holt, were the two characters in the long robe,

robe, whoſe conduct he always wiſhed and aimed to expreſs in his own. Yet this writer calls him 'a Prerogative Lawyer.' We all know what theſe words will be generally underſtood to imply; and it is ſufficient to anſwer, that not this pamphleteer only, but all others are defied to give one ſingle inſtance of the late Lord Chancellor's having at any time, in any place, or upon any occaſion, attempted or aimed at any extenſion of the prerogative; nay, it may be ſaid, for it is well known, in ſome proſecutions which he was to conduct as Attorney-General in very tickliſh times, he managed with ſuch ability and candor as at once to give the moſt entire ſatisfaction to the Adminiſtration, whoſe directions he enforced, and even to extort the eſteem and admiration of the principal leaders of the Oppoſition, who were moſt immediately intereſted in the event of thoſe proſecutions.

But 'he leaned in his notions too much 'towards ariſtocracy.' I ſhould be glad to aſk this writer, whether the Bill for aboliſhing the heretable juriſdictions, and the other Bills for the reformation and civilizing of the Highlands in Scotland, which every body remembers to have been projected and conducted by this great perſon, are not the ſtrongeſt proofs of his zeal for the liberties of the community in general on the trueſt principles,

principles, and his not being biaſſed by any undue attachment to ariſtocracy?

The account of his Lordſhip's ſpeech on the preliminaries, in December 1762, is not only a very rude and unmannerly one, (theſe are peccadillos with political writers,) but is abſolutely falſe and contrary to fact. I ſay this with the more confidence, becauſe I have ſeen very faithful and accurate notes of this ſpeech; and I do affirm, that the ſingle objection to the preliminaries, which this author pretends to quote from it, viz. about the boundaries in North America, made no part of the ſpeech, nor was ſo much as mentioned in it. The truth is, the noble Lord acted in this matter upon the moſt honourable and temperate principle. He had been juſt then diſmiſſed from the Cabinet, and could only in the Houſe of Lords deliver his ſentiments on this great national meaſure. He acknowledged readily his approbation of many things; and thoſe which he diſapproved, he objected to with ſuch propriety, and with ſuch weight, that ſome of them were actually corrected in the definitive treaty; and others would have been probably, had we had the good fortune to carry on and conclude our negociations for the peace with the ſame national unanimity with which we ſet out.

And this naturally leads to a queſtion, which this father of candor, as he calls himſelf,

himſelf, has affectedly put and left undetermined; "whether his Lordſhip underſtood foreign affairs or not?" Thoſe who want yet to ſettle their judgments in this matter will rather be directed, I ſhould ſuppoſe, by the opinion of ſuch as had frequent opportunity of hearing him in the Houſe, or at the Council Board, than by the crude conceptions of this malevolent writer.

We are next inſtructed concerning his Lordſhip's conduct, and the motives to it, in regard to the militia, the habeas corpus, and the marriage acts. In his ſpeech on the firſt of theſe, which I well remember, he averred of himſelf the very reverſe to what this man affirms of him, *ultri creditis quirites?* And, after urging his objections to the plan then ſent up from the Commons, he declared himſelf in favour of a well-regulated militia; and propoſed ſuch alterations in any future ſcheme as were all adopted the next year, were approved in both Houſes, and received the Royal Aſſent.

As to the habeas corpus, there was indeed a bill with a very ſpecious title carried through the Houſe of Commons in 1758, with the full tide of popular eloquence: but it ſhould be remembered, that ſome of the moſt diſtinguiſhed lawyers in that Houſe ſtrenuouſly oppoſed it; and when it came up to the other, the ſubject underwent a more deliberate and

and ſolemn diſcuſſion. The judges' opinions were taken upon the leading principles of the bill; and they gave it as their unanimous opinion, that the writ of habeas corpus was of right and not of courſe, and that ſome affidavit or allegation of probable cauſe was neceſſary to found the demand upon. In the debate which afterwards enſued, ſo many inconveniencies were pointed out in ſo maſterly a manner by the noble Lord here aſperſed, ſupported by a noble Lord of the ſame learned profeſſion, that the Houſe was convinced of the great impropriety and unfitneſs of the Bill, and rejected it without a diviſion. The proteſt, which followed was only ſigned by one ſolitary Lord.

With regard to the marriage act, we cannot but remember how long ſome proviſions of this kind had been called for; and, without entering into a diſcuſſion of all the points, or indeed of any, which may be diſputed on this argument, we may affirm with a truth, that the bill did not take its riſe from this noble perſon, but from a motion made by another, with whom he was not connected in buſineſs; that the bill prepared by the Judges was by every body deemed inadequate, and the noble Lord on the wool-pack unanimouſly requeſted to prepare a more effectual one. This he did with the firmeſt perſuaſion, which he retained to his laſt hour, of the general

general reaſonableneſs and fitneſs of what is there enacted; yet withal conſtantly profeſſing an entire readineſs to concur and aſſiſt in framing any reaſonable amendments, to meet with any real inconveniencies, which the preſent bill had been found to occaſion.

To pronounce concerning any man's ſecret motives, is in the higheſt degree preſumptuous; but if this be in all caſes hazardous, and in moſt caſes ungenerous, what ſhall we ſay of a writer who with equal folly and aſſurance ſuppoſes, that "a perfectly good Judge, a truly wiſe magiſtrate, a perſon of natural good temper, and of the ſoundeſt underſtanding in matters of law and equity;" all of theſe qualities uſually proceeding from ſound principles, and tending to produce upright conduct, ſhould yet not deſerve the appellation of "a true Patriot;" ſhould have joined in oppoſition, merely from private and perſonal diſſatisfaction; ſhould have acted frequently and repeatedly with an utter ignorance of our national intereſts, both foreign and domeſtic; and ſhould, in one caſe particularly, (that of the marriage act,) have gone upon a view, which, far leſs circumſpection, experience, and knowledge of the world than his Lordſhip is admitted to have poſſeſſed, muſt convince any man is the moſt abſurd, wild, and irrational, that can be entertained or imagined, viz. "The perpetuating

perpetuating a fortune or family once made, &c." The diverſity of family characters, in a very few generations, or even in one and the ſame often, and the ceaſeleſs fluctation of events in the ſame family, muſt ſatisfy every body, that no man of good ſenſe in worldly matters, which is graciouſly allowed to this noble perſon, could amuſe himſelf with ſuch a viſionary and romantic idea. *Vitæ ſumna brevis ſpem nos vetat inchoäre longam.*

As to the many petulant and malignant inſinuations thrown out in various parts of this pamphlet on the deſcendents from this great and excellent perſon, I am perſuaded, they all of them as much and as thoroughly deſpiſe them as they little deſerve them. I ſhall therefore ſay nothing at all to any thing levelled at them; nor ſhould indeed have written what I have in defence of their noble father, ſo illiberally and wantonly attacked, if I had not always, on the juſteſt reaſons, entertained the higheſt reverence for his perſon and virtues, and had not been really affected with an honeſt indignation at ſeeing his aſhes, ſcarce cold yet, trampled upon in ſo diſreſpectful a manner, and his excellent character ſo unneceſſarily and ſo rudely calumniated. I ſay calumniated; for I cannot help retorting on this writer his own idea, and pronouncing his performance (as far as relates to the part here animadverted on)

a *libel*

a *libel* in all its forms; that is, according to his own definition of one, both *falſe* and *malicious*.

December 15, 1764.

To the Printer of the Public Advertiſer.

THE extraordinary demand for a pamphlet, entitled, "A Letter concerning Libels, "Warrants, &c." owing partly to the nature of the ſubject it profeſſes to treat, and not a little to ſome other ingredients with which it is ſeaſoned, having brought it to a fourth edition; I had endeavoured to perſuade myſelf that the author or authors, convinced by the information they muſt have received through ſeveral of the public papers, of the groſs and wilful miſtakes they had been guilty of in reſpect to ſome memorable facts, as well as ſome characters which deſerved a different treatment, would have ſo far liſtened to the calls of truth and juſtice, as to have expunged ſeveral paſſages which appeared in the former editions, containing the moſt injurious reflections on the dead as well as the living; reflections not warranted in any manner, nor to be accounted for or explained, except upon the amiable motives of envy, jealouſy, and a ſpirit of faction.

But

But as I find upon looking into the third edition, that inſtead of acting as became friends to truth, or even generous adverſaries; inſtead of retracting falſehoods or miſtakes however palpable, they have not only repeated them again and again, but at the ſame time accumulated new injuries and new calumnies; I think it incumbent upon thoſe who have any knowledge of the real characters and facts, which theſe worthy aſſertors of liberty and the conſtitution of their country have ſo traduced, to ſtand forth, and not ſuffer the unprejudiced part of mankind to be deceived by the groſs partiality and flagrant malice of ſuch writers. It is with this view alone (deteſting as I do the warfare of newſpapers and party pamphlets) that I have been induced to undertake the drudgery of pointing out and expoſing ſome of the falſe imputations, which have been heaped with ſuch peculiar virulence, upon the memory and public conduct of the late Earl of Hardwicke, in the later editions of this bulky libel.

Some ſtrictures having already been made [The preceding paper addreſſed to the Printer of the Public Advertiſer.] with great truth and propriety, upon the injurious and malicious attempt towards a character of this noble perſon as it ſtood in the firſt edition of this performance, I ſhall wholly confine myſelf

myſelf to ſuch alterations and additions as have ſince appeared in it.

In the firſt place, this *Father of Candour* has thought fit to ſtigmatize ſome proceedings in his late Majeſty's reign againſt a certain V. C. of Oxford, as being very oppreſſive, and in the ſame breath to impute them, without the leaſt heſitation or ceremony, to Lord Hardwicke's advice and direction; not caſting the leaſt cenſure upon the late Sir D. Ryder, then Attorney-General, who conducted the proſecution as far as it went, and who had too much experience and ability in his profeſſion to want advice or direction; and was by principle and education too zealous a Whig, and of too humane a temper, to lay the heavy hand of power upon any ſubject, however *worthleſs*, where the Law and his duty did not fully authorize and require it. But why then is it charged upon this Noble Lord? Does it appear, or can it be pretended with the leaſt truth, that he was even aſked his opinion about it, much more that he gave any ſuch advice or direction to the Attorney-General? Does merely holding the Great Seal then, and aſſiſting at the Cabinet Council, make a man reſponſible for an Attorney-General's execution of his office? If ſo, why is not the Noble Lord who at preſent fills that ſtation, arraigned throughout this libel for every ſtep of the proceeding

ing againſt Mr. Wilkes, inſtead of the two Secretaries of State, and the late and preſent Attorney-General.

The next thing which preſents itſelf is a modeſt aſſertion (introduced into a long and laboured paſſage, which is intended, I ſuppoſe, to paſs for a complete character of his Lordſhip) of his having once *affected* the title of Earl of Clarendon. A more abſurd piece of falſehood was never invented, nor one leſs probable in the caſe of a man, who had for ſo many years ennobled his own name by the force of his own genius, nor leſs ſuitable to the judgment, modeſty, and whole behaviour of that noble perſon. The truth is, he more than once declined the honour of the advancement itſelf; during which time a report being ſpread, that his late Majeſty was graciouſly pleaſed to intend it for him, it was ſeveral times inſerted in the Newspapers, that he was to be created Earl of Clarendon. This is literally the whole foundation there ever was, or could be, for ſuch an idle tale, unleſs one could ſuppoſe it was deſigned to give uneaſineſs to the family and deſcendents of that celebrated Miniſter.

He then proceeds to give a moſt falſe account of Lord Hardwicke's ſpeech in the Houſe of Lords upon the Preliminaries. I don't mean to dwell upon ſuch inſinuations or expreſſions as have already been animadverted

verted upon; but it is impoſſible to let ſuch notorious falſehoods be repeated and aggravated day after day, without expreſſing a juſt indignation at ſuch ſhameleſs profligacy. He was ſo far from objecting to the Boundaries between the Britiſh and French Colonies in North-America, ſettled by that treaty, that he thought them the beſt imaginable. This the author has been already told in print; notwithſtanding which, as if determined to bear down even truth itſelf by mere effrontery, he has added a particularity to the ſuppoſed objection as fooliſh and as falſe as all the reſt.

What opinion their Lordſhips entertained of his ſpeech that day, I ſhall not preſume to determine: Sure I am, however, that he retained the powers of his mind too perfect even to the laſt to give the leaſt colour for the low compariſon, under which the prejudiced and vulgar ideas of this malignant Writer have thought fit to repreſent him.

He felt perhaps as few of the defects of age as moſt of his contemporaries, and yet he has been known to ſay of himſelf in that Aſſembly, *Non eadem eſt Ætas, non Mens.* But let thoſe who remember the part he ſuſtained for ſo many years at the Bar, upon the Bench, and in Parliament, during the warmeſt political conteſts againſt the ableſt ſpeakers, recollect the light in which he always

always appeared; his grace, ſtrength, and dignity of manner; quickneſs and comprehenſion of thought; and let them ſay if they can, that he had neither imagination, wit, or eloquence; that he betrayed on any occaſion a want of the ornamental and graceful accompliſhments of literature, in which he had the felicity to be better grounded, and to have more accuracy and extent than almoſt any man who had engaged ſo early and ſo long in public buſineſs; or that he gave any marks of that *Plainneſs* of education, which this polite, ingenious, and accompliſhed writer, with as little regard to truth as decency, is pleaſed to beſtow upon him.

The reflections caſt upon his ſpeech on the firſt draught of the Militia Bill ſent up by the Houſe of Commons in 1756, have been ſo fully anſwered in a former paper, that I ſhall ſay but little to them. I muſt however obſerve, that though he ſuggeſted many and weighty political objections to that Bill, he made none of a *religious* nature, unleſs the author is abſurd enough to call diſapproving the mode, prepared in that Bill, of exerciſing the men on Sundays, a religious objection. So far from enervating the ſcheme, by propoſing to reduce the number to one-half, he made it by that means a practicable meaſure; and whoever will attempt to increaſe the number, will have

enough to contend with in anſwering the complaints of the country upon ſuch an augmentation. So far from contriving to defeat the execution of it in his particular county after it became a law, the moſt punctual obedience was paid to the Act in every particular by the noble perſon who was then, and is now, his Majeſty's Lieutenant in that county; the Militia of which was actually raiſed and diſciplined for two years together during the war, and is now on foot again, and was called out to their annual exerciſe in May laſt.

There is but one thing more which truth compels me to take notice of, and that is, what this well-informed writer thinks proper to ſay, with regard to the judges who were called to that important ſtation, whilſt the Great Seal was in his hands. Can any one who looks round Weſtminſter-Hall at this hour, forget who recommended many of the ableſt who now ſit there? as able and as upright men as ever adminiſtered juſtice in any age or any country. Can he forget or affect to treat with contempt the names of *profeſſional* merit of ſome who are dead, or retired, Reeves, Lee, Ryder, Strange, Wright, Burnet, Foſter, Clarke, and others, who might be mentioned? Or will he venture to aſſert, that theſe men obtained their ſeats upon the bench by *miniſterial*, not *profeſſional*, merit.

Though

Though I perceive that the ſubject has carried me farther than I at firſt deſigned, yet before I have quite done with it, I think ſome notice ſhould be taken of the many ſcattered paſſages in this curious medley of factious politics, extravagant law doctrines, and perſonal abuſe, inſerted with the generous purpoſe of depreciating, by this virulent libel, the honour and reputation of the family and deſcendants of the noble perſon above mentioned. But as there happens to be one among them, whoſe talents, eloquence, learning, and integrity, have raiſed him to a height in the profeſſion of the law, which in the general eſteem of the Bar, and in the public voice, gave him juſt and regular pretenſions to the firſt honours in it; who filled, for many years, two great ſtations, with as much capacity and reputation, as any man whatever; and who lately reſigned one of them, ſo as to aſſert his own honour and ſentiments with the moſt weight and freedom, at the hazard of every thing which can be called profit or ambition; who is too knowing to be dictated to on points which concern the law and conſtitution; too ſagacious and honeſt to be made a fool; too wiſe and temperate in his public conduct to pleaſe the ſelfiſh, the intereſted, and the violent; too free and independent in his ſituation and fortune, *to lay himſelf* (in the language of this

writer) *at the feet of any man*, or to caſt his opinions into any miniſterial or popular mould, becauſe it may happen to ſuit with the times, or with his own intereſt: He is therefore peculiarly marked out for vengeance,—his conduct in Parliament miſrepreſented and traduced, where in truth it gained him much credit in all the inſtances alluded to; and his good name to be branded with every ill-natured epithet, and falſe reflection, which the inſolence, the injuſtice, and the private views of others can ſuggeſt.

After all, let me appeal to the zealous admirers of this libeller, whether he who wantonly ſacrifices the truth of facts, and characters above ſuſpicion, to the dark purpoſes of calumny and envy, has the leaſt claim to the applauſe or confidence of any party.

Law diſpenſed by ſuch writers, is like a ſword in the hands of a madman; it will ſtab indeed, but it will ſtab in the dark, the friends rather than the enemies of the Conſtitution; and thus it may become a terror to innocent and worthy citizens, inſtead of an inſtrument of juſtice againſt profligate Miniſters and lawleſs ſubjects.

January 30, 1765.

THE

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

February 3, 1780.

FROM the ſpirited proceedings of the petitioning counties, the nation has already gained one great advantage. It has had the faireſt opportunity of trying the different pretenſions of thoſe who profeſſed to have its welfare and glory at heart. Private intereſt and public utility have erected their ſeveral ſtandards. The mercenary bands of the one have been driven to the neceſſity of ſeparating themſelves *publicly* from the friends of the other. The great *party* of the nation ſtands glorioufly diſtinguiſhed from the *factious retainers* of a corrupt Adminiſtration.

The imputation of the ſelfiſh views of ambition and avarice, ſo artfully thrown out againſt the oppoſers of the preſent diſgraceful ſyſtem, has at length been unqueſtionably brought home to the ſupporters of that ſyſtem; and oppoſition has gained that confidence from the people, to which their patriotic exertions had ſo long, and ſo juſtly entitled them.

An event ſo deſirable is not more to be aſcribed to the conduct of the petitioners, than to the meaſures purſued by the few who

oppoſe

oppoſe them. We are indebted, I hope, to the goodneſs of Providence for the ſelection of theſe men. Zealous without knowledge, abilities or diſcretion, they have been betrayed into an avowal of the ſecret deſigns of their employers. Tranſported by an eager deſire of recommending themſelves, they have divulged the dark myſteries of the court, and explained its deep laid ſchemes and arbitrary doctrines, to an aſſembly of Britiſh freeholders.

Theſe doctrines, it is true, we have ſeen artfully inculcated, for ſeveral paſt, in all the venal productions of the miniſterial prints. From the learned Penſioner, [Dr. Samuel Johnſon.] whoſe talents were once happily employed in the ſervice of his country, down to the writers of daily eſſays, and newſpaper paragraphs, not a mercenary pen but has inſinuated them more or leſs covertly. But the formal and authentic confeſſion of them was reſerved for the daring and intrepid ſpirit of Mr. Smelt.

Emboldened by the boundleſs favour he enjoyed with his Sovereign, that gentleman thought himſelf authoriſed to ſpeak without fear or reſtraint. With that familiarity to which he has been ſo long admitted, *he ſnatched away the veil* the petitioners had reſpectfully drawn round the throne. He boldly produced the perſon of his royal friend,

and,

and, to a ſet of men who pointed their cenſures only at his Miniſters, held him up as an object of the juſteſt terror, and the moſt alarming apprehenſion.

For what were his words? Did this boſom confident of the King of a free people heſitate to repreſent him to his diſtant ſubjects in the light of an Aſiatic deſpot? to ſeat him amid the blaze and *unapproachable ſplendour of majeſty*, ſelf-honoured, ſelf-beloved, and ſelf-enjoyed. Did he heſitate to propoſe the creature of the conſtitution to the adoration of the public, as the firſt animating principle, the great informing ſpirit, the eſſence of that very power to which it owes even its exiſtence? Did he not even make his boaſt of the indignation with which he was fired, when he heard his royal protector ſtyled *the ſervant of the people?* A title which the moſt deſpotic monarchs, at leaſt, *affect* to glory in, as the ſureſt to enthrone them in the hearts of their ſubjects, but which, it ſeems, is conſidered as an inſult on a deſcendant of the Houſe of Brunſwick! To whom, then, is that Prince indebted for the crown he wears? To the people aſſerting their rights. To whom does he owe the preference given to his line over the elder branches of the Houſe of Stuart? To the people. Why is he not at this inſtant buried in obſcurity, confounded among the petty Princes who are ſubſidiary to the

the throne, to which the ſubverſion of the doctrines of his favourite, paved him the way? Why, but for the people aſſerting their rights, and delegating a power which it was theirs alone to confer? And ſhall it be a diſgrace to this Prince to be ſtyled the ſervant of that people? Shall the man, whom he has taken to his boſom, declare the very *idea to be narrow, little and mean*, unworthy of a King of England?

The public and authentic avowal of the doctrines of the Court produced the effects it was natural to expect among the deſcendants of the revolutioniſts. Whigs and Tories equally took the alarm. The whole body of the freeholders of York, whom their diſtreſſes had aſſembled, with a view of examining into the cauſe of their grievances, were convinced by Mr. Smelt of the neceſſity of concurring in the meaſures propoſed to them by the promoters of the petition. For at the very moment they were complaining of the *ſecret* influence of the Crown, they were inſulted by an open declaration of its ambitious and unconſtitutional views. While they were expreſſing their fears at an encreaſe of a dangerous power, purchaſed under hand by the money of the public, they heard it declared by unqueſtionable authority, that *in the doctrine of the Court* this power required to *be encreaſed greatly*, beyond even its preſent

preſent encroachments. They were beſeeching their repreſentatives to adopt the moſt ſteady and effectual meaſures for relieving the country from the enormous weight of taxes with which it was oppreſſed, and they were told that in the doctrine of the Court this country could never be *properly* governed, till thoſe taxes ſhould be rendered perpetual, and till the nation ſhould be precluded from every hope of relief. Even thoſe who had attended the aſſembly with an intention of oppoſing the petition, were compelled by ſuch alarming diſcoveries to join in the prayer of it; and all the fruits produced by the effuſion of this *very loyal zealot*, were to give unanimity to the meeting, and to unite all parties in one great conſtitutional cauſe.

If the nation has derived ſo great an advantage from the raſh and impetuous zeal of Mr. Smelt, it is no leſs indebted to the conduct of the perſons employed by the Miniſter in another county, *(Hertford.)* Nature has been very ſparing of her gifts to the young nobleman, *(Saliſbury)* whom he has placed at their head. But his Lordſhip endeavours to make up by zeal what he wants in abilities. It fills us with indignation to hear of the infamous arts employed to miſlead the ignorant, and intimidate the dependent, whom the agents of that nobleman, and of his penſioned aſſiſtants, induce to ſign the

Hertford

Hertford proteſt. A proteſt againſt the proceedings of a meeting, at which they did not even aſſiſt, and of which they muſt, conſequently, be utterly ignorant. A proteſt, the very firſt clauſe of which is no leſs an inſult on their underſtanding, than an outrage on their feelings as Engliſhmen. It renounces one of the moſt ſacred rights they enjoy. It diſclaims a privilege which their anceſtors bled to ſecure, and which they tranſmitted to their poſterity, as a dear bought and invaluable inheritance.

Infatuated people! while they put their hands to their own condemnation; while they ſign the inſtrument of their own ſlavery, and encourage their hard taſk maſters to encreaſe their burdens, the men by whoſe intereſted arts they are duped and miſled, reap the fruits of their folly, and fatten on their ſpoils. The leaders, whom they blindly follow, are the very men who enjoy the enormous ſalaries and unmerited penſions, which the ſounder part of their fellow-freeholders require to be converted from the enriching of individuals to the ſervice of the State. Even now the golden reward hangs ready to the graſp of their Lord Lieutenant, (*Saliſbury*,) and animates him to perſeverance. The lucrative employment (*Treaſurer of the Houſehold*,) ſo generouſly reſigned by a virtuous young nobleman, (*Carliſle*,) who ſcorned

to

to owe any part of his ſplendor to the ſufferings of the people, he claims as his due. He counts it as earned by his ſervices in the favourite cauſe of corruption. He triumphs in the gains he has made from the credulity of the deluded inſtruments of his growing ambition, and maintains that he is invited by themſelves to ſhare in their plunder.

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

To the Earl of H———GH.

February 17, 1780.

MY LORD,

WHEN the defection of the houſe of Bedford compelled the interior cabinet to ſeek for fit characters to ſupply at the Council-Board the furious and vindictive ſpirit of that party, they naturally caſt their eyes upon your Lordſhip. The principles which have invariably directed your political conduct, and the temper and diſpoſitions you had manifeſted at a former memorable criſis, fully juſtified their choice. It promiſed as favourably to the intereſts of their ſyſtem, as it boded ill to the happineſs of this country, and alarmed the friends of the conſtitution in proportion to the ſatisfaction expreſſed on your

your appointment by the creatures of the Court.

For my own part, I am free to confeſs, that I by no means felt all that terror and apprehenſion which your return to office diffuſed amongſt moſt ranks of men. If your abilities, indeed, could keep pace with the wiſhes of your heart, I ſhould think that Heaven, in its utmoſt diſpleaſure, could not inflict a heavier curſe on this nation, than to ſuffer you to take a part in the direction of its councils. But in the weakneſs of your underſtanding, I thought I ſaw a reſource againſt the depravity of your principles, and the malignancy of your deſigns. I even conceived ſome hopes of public advantage from the effects of your adminiſtration. A raſh and ungovernable zeal, that excluded all prudence and diſcretion, and diſdained all reſtraint, might not, I imagined, prove unſerviceable to the cauſe of the people. Your conduct at the commencement of the American diſſenſions was freſh in my recollection. The illiberal and ill grounded cenſures, and the violent and unconſtitutional proceedings by which you drove the colonies into rebellion, and tore aſunder all the bonds that united them to the parent ſtate, gave me no room to miſtake the line you were likely to follow in our preſent domeſtic diſtractions. I looked for a repetition of the ſame impo-

litic councils. I could entertain no doubt that the ſame inſolent and intemperate meaſures were meant to be purſued. The public would neceſſarily be ſtruck with the reſemblance, and the ſad leſſon they had been taught by the reſult of thoſe meaſures among the coloniſts would naturally put them on their guard againſt them, when they ſaw that they aimed immediately at their own peace and happineſs, and would open their eyes to the real intentions of government.

Your conduct has fully juſtified my ſuſpicions. In the violent reſolutions lately adopted in the cabinet againſt the favourers of the petitions, the people evidently diſcovered the traces of your character. You may reſt aſſured, my Lord, that they give you entire credit for them. You may expect at their hands the fulleſt retribution, and the juſteſt recompence. But if they could have entertained any doubts on the ſubject, you have taken care effectually to remove them. You have declared yourſelf their profeſſed enemy, in one of the moſt delicate and eſſential points. You have confeſſed yourſelf to be one, at leaſt, of the Miniſters who labour to alienate the affections of his Majeſty from a majority of his moſt loyal and affectionate ſubjects.

If their humble and dutiful petitions to be eaſed of the oppreſſive burdens under which they

they labour, have been misrepresented to their Sovereign as *factious, and founded merely in a spirit of violence and party*, your Lordship acknowledges yourself to be one of the authors of such misrepresentation.

If their constitutional meetings to collect the sentiments of the public, and legally to convey them to the representatives, to whom that public has delegated the guardianship of its rights, and the defence of its property, be misrepresented at the foot of the throne as *dangerous, disloyal, seditious combinations, evidently tending to rebellion*, your Lordship acknowledges yourself to be the author of such misrepresentations.

If the freeholders of England be denied the privileges that have been acknowledged to belong to other subjects of the empire; if the *armed* associations of Ireland have had the sanction and approbation of the Minister, and if their *peremptory* demands have procured redress, while our *humble* and *submissive* representations have been branded as *seditious and tending to rebellion*, to your Lordship they are *particularly* indebted for the insulting distinction.

If his Majesty has been counselled to dismiss from the government of counties, (Lord *Pembroke*, &c.) men of the first character and property in his dominions, for exerting the privileges reserved to them in common

common with the reſt of their fellow-ſubjects, by the ſame power to which he is indebted for his own title to the throne, your Lordſhip acknowledges yourſelf to be one of the authors of that council—you pledge yourſelf to perſevere in the *reſolution and firmneſs neceſſary* to *ſubdue* thoſe men—to puniſh, *without pity*, the petitioners and their ſupporters, and all who dare maintain the legality of their proceedings, or their right to repreſent their grievances, and call for redreſs.

Has your Lordſhip weighed well the conſequences of this open attack on the majeſty of the people? What preparations have you made to meet their collected indignation? In other queſtions between them and the different members of Adminiſtration, they may content themſelves with ſupplicating for redreſs. In this they muſt call aloud for *vengeance*. In vain will you have recourſe to the ſtate device of confounding your own cauſe with the cauſe of the crown and conſtitution. You may procure the willing votes of a *corrupt majority in parliament* by holding up every attack on your adminiſtration as an attack on the ſtate; but to the feelings of the freeholders of Great-Britain, whom you have inſulted, vilified, and traduced, and on whoſe rights you have trampled, ſuch arguments will only prove an aggravation to your guilt.

Believe me, my Lord, they are fully

aware of your deſigns. They have little reaſon to forget the tranſactions of your former adminiſtration. They recollect that the *very terms of that black hand-writing*, by which you firſt denounced the vengeance of adminiſtration againſt the devoted Coloniſts, were the ſame that fell from the tranſports of your furious zeal in the late debate in the Houſe of Lords.

In that fatal inſtrument of irrevocable proſcription, you repreſented a meaſure perfectly legal, perfectly conſtitutional, a meaſure that tended ſolely to lay the grievances of the ſubject before the throne, as *inflammatory in its nature, tending to create unwarrantable combinations, and calculated to inflame the minds of the people.* You exhorted the creatures of government to defeat ſo *flagitious an attempt, and to treat it with the contempt it deſerved.* You denied it to be the *reſolution of the majority of* the people, but of a ſet of *factious deſigning men;* and you afterwards procured *a proteſt* from the inhabitants of the village of Hatfield to prove your aſſertions. You threatened the *authors and ſupporters* of ſuch proceedings with *puniſhment without pity;* and you warned them that *proper care* ſhould be taken to maintain the *dignity* of government. The reſult has proved what that *proper care* was deſigned to have been; and thus did you drive a loyal and ſubmiſſive

people

people into all the exceſſes of rebellion, which you falſely laid to their charge.

High and honeſt minds can ill brook unmerited ſuſpicions. Reſentment at the undeſerved imputation of the guilt they abhor ſometimes precipitates them into the actual commiſſion of that very guilt; and when inſolent and falſe accuſations are followed by intemperate violence, and arbitrary perſecution, they ſeldom fail of this effect. The great Condé tells us, that he went into the Baſtile the moſt loyal and dutiful ſubject in his Sovereign's dominions, and that he came out his moſt implacable enemy. Hiſtory could furniſh a thouſand ſimilar examples. Your Lordſhip has added to them one of the moſt fatal and inſtructive that ever ſtained its page. That you have not profited either by your own experience, or the experience of others diſqualifies you from governing the affairs of men, who are at all times actuated by like paſſions on like trials. In accounting for your conduct, your Lordſhip and the public will think very differently. Your beſt friends excuſe you at the expence of your underſtanding. But whatever the preſent times may determine, you may hope that poſterity, though it will never look up to you as a pattern to imitate, will at leaſt propoſe you as an example to deter.

In this time of your ambition you muſt

however be content to have driven one country into rebellion. By your miſrepreſentations of the deſigns of the Coloniſts to the Engliſh nation, you armed them againſt each other, and ſteeped their hands in kindred blood. But you cannot miſrepreſent the intentions of the freeholders of this kingdom to themſelves.

They have taken their ſtand within the hallowed circle of the conſtitution, as it is marked out by the venerable hands of their anceſtors; nor can all the ſorceries and blandiſhments of the Court entice them, or all your official menaces and inſolent imputations drive them, beyond that ſacred line. They will do themſelves *juſtice*; but they will do it with the temper, moderation, and ſteadineſs that become their cauſe. They will ſtand up for the *majeſty of the people*, and they, who ſhall dare to prove traitors to that majeſty, muſt become *the objects of their jealous vengeance*, *having ſinned* WITHOUT PROVOCATION, *they muſt expect to be puniſhed with juſtice but* WITHOUT PITY."—See Lord *Mulgrave's* ſpeech in the Houſe of Commons.

THE

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

To the PETITIONERS.

March 2, 1780.

ONE of your principal objects of complaint is the miſapplication of the national revenues in penſions, unmerited by public ſervices, and laviſhed by the Crown in the purchaſe of an undue influence in both Houſes of Parliament. You have petitioned your repreſentatives to enquire into this abuſe; you have prayed them to remove it, if it ſhould be found to exiſt, and to appropriate the ſavings that might be made by ſuch a reform to the exigencies of the State.

In compliance with this part of the inſtructions of his conſtituents, Sir George Savile has moved for a liſt of penſions, ſpecifying the names of the perſons to whom they are paid, and the amount of the ſums they reſpectively receive. Without ſuch a liſt it would be impoſſible to remove your doubts, or to gratify your wiſhes. No other rule of diſcrimination could be ſet up, by which your repreſentatives could judge of the ſeveral titles of the penſioners; there were no other means by which they could

gain a certain knowledge of the ſums ſquandered away in that ſcandalous traffic, or of what the public could ſave from its ſuppreſſion.

But what was the conduct of the Miniſter? —He neither had the virtue to acknowledge the juſtice of the motion, nor the courage to reject it. We had never formed a hope that he would pay the leaſt attention to the prayer of the people; but at leaſt he might have come forward, like a man, and diſputed the point with your friends, on the grounds of impolicy, inexpediency, or danger. We might have looked for the plauſible reaſonings of an able Miniſter, and he inſulted us with the pleadings of an Old-Bailey advocate. It was the *people of England againſt corruption*. Every low evaſive art of cunning and ſophiſtry was put in practice, by this tricking council, to miſlead the jury, and to plead the cauſe of his favourite client. He did not dare to give an abſolute and unqualified negative to the prayer of your petitions. He was deſirous of giving ſome colourable excuſe to his creatures for adhering to him; he therefore moved an amendment which ſeemed to pay ſome attention to your requeſts, but which in fact totally defeated their object.

He is called upon to ſubmit to the conſideration of Parliament a liſt of *all* penſions; and he propoſes to produce two, which he affirms

affirms muſt *content the people*. What are thoſe liſts? The one is a liſt of penſions payable at the Exchequer; the other is the private penſions, or what he calls Lord Gage's liſt. The amount of theſe, he tells the Houſe, has been already preſented to Parliament, on an application for an encreaſe of the civil eſtabliſhment. He will not produce the ſeparate ſums, as paid to individuals. The total amount muſt ſatisfy Parliament; and from this amount it will appear, that, notwithſtanding all the preſent clamour, the ſums paid in penſions are ſo trifling and inconſiderable, as to be beneath reformation. They are no object. They ſhould be leſs than nothing in the eſtimation of a *great and wealthy people!* If there be any abuſes, if any undeſerving perſons, or ſums improperly granted, be to be found on either of the liſts, let the gentlemen of the Oppoſition point them out, and not *ſuſpect* where they cannot *arraign*.

Theſe were what the noble Lord was pleaſed to call his unanſwerable arguments againſt the motion. By theſe he laboured to evade the prayer of your petitions. Your repreſentatives, agreeable to your inſtructions, call for information. He tells them they ſhall have it; that is, ſuch information as they have already had, and which they do not want. This he condeſcends to give at the

the requeſt of the people of England. This is what was done on an application of his own for an encreaſe of the Civil Liſt. But the information which alone can ſatisfy your doubts, and anſwer your expectations—the information that alone can bring to light what, or *if any individuals enjoy ſinecure places, efficient places with exorbitant emoluments, and penſions unmerited by public ſervices*, that you ſhall not have.

But urge him ſtill farther—Why not produce the names of the private liſt? It would not be right, it would not be delicate, all his feelings are alive, every nerve of his trembles for the honour and peace of mind of his penſioners; for you he has no feelings.

If the names on that liſt be ſuch as muſt command the approbation of the public: if they be ſuch as have the moſt indiſputable claims to the gratitude and liberality of a generous nation: if there are no fears that any ſhould be found among them who bluſh not to add to their princely fortunes ſome miſerable ſtipend, drawn from the toils and ſweat of the people; if there are none who receive the infamous wages of a ſilent vote, without the ſhadow of a merit, or even a pretence of public ſervice; if there are none whom we can ſuſpect to be hired to libel every friend of the people, to turn every thing that ſhould be held ſacred and venerable by Engliſhmen

Engliſhmen into ridicule, to brand all pretenſions to patriotiſm or the love of one's country with mockery and ſcorn, openly to attack the moſt invaluable liberties of the ſubject, and to revive, under the reign of a Brunſwick, the arbitrary doctrines and high prerogative principles of a Stuart—if he has no fears of this nature, why not produce the liſt?—you will be undeceived. The odium that was meant to be brought upon his immaculate adminiſtration, will recoil upon thoſe who deviſe it. But he has denied it—he fought in the laſt dyke of his power rather than give it up. The concluſion is ſelf-evident.

But he goes on—"The ſums are trifling; they are beneath the attention of a great and wealthy nation." To what does this argument tend? To the giving a negative to every ſeparate article, as it occurs in the detail of this important buſineſs, and ſo effectually defeating the general reform, which is the object of your warmeſt wiſhes, and moſt anxious expectations. "The ſums are trifling."—How has he proved this? has he dared to aver that theſe are the only liſts which ingulph the treaſures of the public? where is that liſt, drawn up in darkneſs, and under all the terrors of ſhame and guilt, which is no ſooner preſented, approved, and diſcharged, then it is committed to the flames, and the very aſhes of it ſcattered abroad to the

the winds, the liſt of thoſe Members of Parliament who, at the end of every ſeſſion, receive the wages of their treachery to their conſtituents? where is the liſt of *ſecret ſervice money?* where is the liſt paid from the privy purſe? are the ſums to which all theſe amount trifling, and below the attention of *a great and wealthy people?*

Or is the amount of theſe ſums the only conſideration that induces you to demand a general reformation? Does the abolition of that dangerous influence which the Miniſter purchaſes by theſe penſions, trifling though they were in the great ſcale of national expenditure, form no part of the county petitions? Was the ſum to which Mr. Hampden was taxed for his portion of ſhip-money the only motive that induced him to reſiſt the unconſtitutional impoſition? Where ſhould we now ſeek for our liberties, if that great man had thought as his deſcendants think; if he had acted on the preſent principles of his degenerate family?

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

April 6, 1780.

A FREE conſtitution has little to apprehend from the open attempts of power. If the conſtitution is attempted by aſſault, it moſtly

moſtly happens that the crude councils of precipitate violence defeat their own ends; and if ſuch invaſions on the rights of mankind are undertaken with all the previous arrangement and complex apparatus of arbitrary power, then the alarm precedes the danger, and the friends of liberty are found in a ſtate of preparation: and therefore ſuch conteſts (with the intervention of ſome confuſion) have commonly ended in the execution or the expulſion of the tyrant. The free conſtitution has been known to riſe out of the aſhes of civil diſſenſion with renovated vigour; and after it is confirmed and fortified by the experience of its own ſtrength, it ſtands upon a more ſecure and confident foundation.

I do not know whether to attribute it to the good or evil fortune of this country that no ſuch attempts have appeared in theſe times. If at the beginning of his Majeſty's reign his adviſers had thought proper to avow their intentions, and determined to come to a direct iſſue with his people, the conteſt between deſpotiſm and legal government might have been long ago at an end. We might either coolly have argued the queſtion, and ſettled it on the principles of reaſon; we might have put it to the vote, and decided the diſpute by numbers; or, at worſt, we might have had recourſe to arms, and abided by the deciſion of

of the ſword. Whatever had been the event, we ſhould have had this advantage,—we ſhould have known our ſituation. If legal government had prevailed, the executive power would have been forced to govern the kingdom on the principles of freedom. England might have poſſeſſed in ſecurity her celebrated conſtitution, and remained a free, a happy, and a flouriſhing nation. On the other hand, if the people had been ſubdued, ingenuity might have diſcovered ſome topics of conſolation. Every ſpecies of government is ſaid to poſſeſs ſome peculiar excellence; and I perſuade myſelf, that by length of time and aſſiduity, our Sovereign might have conquered his natural affection for the rights of his ſubjects, and accommodated his talents to an arbitrary throne. His dutiful people would then have acquieſced in the involuntary poſſeſſion of the few and dear-bought advantages of ſlavery.

The preſent ſituation of our country renders it the duty of every citizen to deſire, that a deciſion ſhould take place, which has been delayed, though I hope not precluded, by the peculiar circumſtances of the times. The ambition of the preſent day is not ſuſtained by the ſtern, manly and decided character which dignifies the face of tyranny. An inſatiable appetite for power, that hereditary diſtemper which is never to be purged out of

the blood of royalty, may lurk under the falſe gloſs of a plump, ruddy, unſuſpicious, unmeaning countenance. Ambition will vary her conduct and her engines, as eaſily as ſhe changes her aſpect. Thoſe who have not courage openly to aſſail, may form the hope of undermining the conſtitution. There are ways by which, without the aid of one ſingle quality of eminence, without integrity, magnanimity, induſtry, or capacity, by obſerving and cultivating the natural corruption of human things, it is poſſible to accompliſh the deſtruction of the nobleſt ſyſtem of freedom. All the enemies to liberty have the ſame object. But the ſilent progreſs of this inſidious ſap is attended with one peculiar evil; it ſtrikes at our liberty through the greatneſs and proſperity of our country.

A principle of deſpotiſm in the cloſet, ſtruggling with the forms of a free conſtitution, which it is obliged to uſe while it is endeavouring to corrupt, and which it has neither ſpirit to annihilate nor wiſdom to guide—This repugnancy between the component parts of government—This war between the genius and the mortal inſtruments, is the true and only cauſe of our preſent deplorable ſituation. The calamities we have already ſuffered by its malignant operation, are too many, as well as too evident, to enumerate.

Misfortunes

Misfortunes daily accumulate; and all the conſolation we receive from our worthy Miniſters, is an aſſurance, that the juſtice of our cauſe improves, as our ſituation grows deſperate. In the mean time Provinces are loſt, Juſt quarrels ſucceed to unjuſt, Enemies increaſe, Reſources diminiſh, Wiſdom is a ſtranger to our councils, Experience and ability are baniſhed from every ſervice with the Keppels and the Howes. A ſort of accelerating calamity has come to be the natural condition and habit of our affairs.

An ingenious mind might find an agreeable employment in calculating to what extraordinary velocity of decay the nation will arrive in a given time. But the people, whoſe organs are too groſs to have a perfect reliſh of theſe ſublime and philoſophical ſpeculations, and who pay all the coſt of the experiment, are fully ſatisfied with its preſent progreſs. To ſpeak plain Engliſh, they are weary of taxes impoſed without ſkill, and without end. The moment for the immediate and conſtitutional interference of the people is arrived, when every means to avert the conſequences of a ſyſtematic deſign to corrupt the conſtitution had been tried in vain. The people have at laſt come forward to vindicate their own cauſe. They have acted with ſpirit and with prudence. They are aware that the curſed and abominable principle of deſpotiſm

has ſecured itſelf from their vengeance by a too elevated ſituation. They look, therefore, for the inſtrument of it. They have found the influence of the crown; and in a truly conſtitutional ſpirit, revering the ſacred character of the maſter, they ſeize upon the Miniſter, and drag him to juſtice.

The work is well begun, but is not ended. *Perſeverance* and *conſiſtency* are neceſſary to compleat it. Let the people remember, and let it ſink deep into their minds, that the object of their meetings, their committees, and their aſſociations, is TO RETRENCH THE CORRUPT INFLUENCE OF THE CROWN. Let the people beware not to ſuffer the deſigns of their enemies, ſeconded by the miſtaken zeal of ſome of their friends, to waſte that energy which ought to be employed in an active proſecution of the great, immediate, and practicable object, in idle and wordy diſcuſſions about *unalienable and indefeaſible rights*, and ſuch other pompous, unmeaning ſounds—Not to ſtart ſpeculative queſtions and moot caſes for diſpute ſake, in order to divide themſelves—Not to place humbling blocks for the feet of their beſt friends—Not to deceive and entrap themſelves by erecting inadequate or falſe ſtandards for judging the friends of the conſtitution.

Upon theſe points I ſhall, perhaps, trouble the public (if it is found neceſſary) on ſome future

future occaſion. At preſent I turn myſelf towards the enemy. I ſhall employ the remainder of this paper to expoſe a parliamentary artifice which has been employed in obſtructing the deſires of the people. The minions of the court, aſſuming the character of friends to the revolution endeavour to perſuade the people that they preſerve one of its inſtitutions, by defending the corrupt influence of the Crown.

It has hitherto been the invariable policy of the preſent ſyſtem to conceal its intentions, and to carry on in ſilence its attacks on the conſtitution. But the ſtratagem of the preſent moment is to deceive us by a pretended affection; to betray us with a kiſs; and to ſtifle us with its embraces. The Treaſury Bench has of late afforded a ſcene of ſome novelty. The good, old, plain, ſimple-hearted, unſuſpecting, honeſt tories, ſtand aghaſt at the unuſual ſallies of thoſe, whoſe ſuppletory underſtandings having purchaſed with their money, they eſteemed their own, and imagined entirely devoted to the cauſe. The Scotch Advocate, with the pompous ſwell of his barbarous diction, chaunts forth the praiſes of King William, and calls up the ghoſts of departed Dundas's to teſtify his attachment to the Revolution. The ingenuous offspring of the diſintereſted Hertford, riſes into an unuſual ſtrain of eloquence, while

while he enforces (for once without heſitation) the tenets of the revolution. Even the Secretary at War, the faithful truſtee of the principles and power of the Earl of Bute, is filled with pious horrors, leſt the conſtitution of that glorious æra ſhould be abandoned in the reign of George the Third. There is ſome reaſon to apprehend that the enthuſiaſm of liberty, which in the year 1768 and 1769 (I cannot ſay warmed but inflamed Mr. Wedderburne) will now be quite exhauſted by that fury of declamation, which, to uſe Milton's expreſſion, "burns frore, and cold performs the effect of fire."

The ardour of affection with which theſe gentlemen oppreſs the revolution, throws ſome ſuſpicion on their ſincerity. What they *ſay* will never obliterate the memory of what they *were*. The people of England are not to be taught to love the revolution, and to defend its inſtitutions by its new converts from the other ſide of the Tweed, or the other ſide of the water. We know the true value of the revolution; but we ſhould pay a poor compliment to thoſe great characters who have bought with their blood the rights which we enjoy, if we deſpiſed and rejected the principles on which they acted: if we ſacrificed to their inſtitutions, or to any inſtitutions, thoſe maxims in which conſiſt the life and ſpirit of freedom. In

all

all conſtitutional queſtions let us conſult the practice of thoſe very men. They left the conſtitution in form and ſhape, as it ſtood before them: they propped the old walls; where time and neglect had bent the mouldered ſides into decay—they let fall the plummet and reſtored the original perpendicular. But quitting the alluſion, I ſhall only obſerve, that of poſitive inſtitution they added little, becauſe they knew and deſpiſed the corruptible nature of all human inſtitutions. But they introduced, or at leaſt they revived in the conſtitution a principle which, with proper attention, will keep it for ever alive. They taught to the world, a great, and to all kings a terrible, and to us their poſterity in particular, this uſeful leſſon; —that government is not made for the ſake of preſerving its own forms;—that it is not made to be the inſtrument of caprice, ambition, vanity, cruelty, treachery, and all the other vices into which certain ſituations will collect and foſter every particle of depravity which exiſts in the human breaſt; but that all government was inſtituted, ſolely, for the happineſs and proſperity of mankind. They inſtructed us as a duty, and a moral obligation, not to ſuffer a divine inſtitution, to be perverted into an inſtrument of miſery and ſlavery. They confirmed the whole by an example—not bloody as in the furious

and

and fanatical days of Charles; zealous, yet wiſe; temperate, yet effective. They ſent him to ſupplicate at the feet of his enemies; a royal fugitive to wander through the courts of Europe in miſery and contempt. That example is not held out to us as an object of imitation; God forbid! It was intended, and I hope it will anſwer its end, to eſtabliſh in the conſtitution, what cannot be obtained by any inſtitutions, an effective and durable principle of freedom.

If the influence of the Crown, pervading and corrupting every department of the ſtate, is ſuffered to render parliament, miniſters, army, navy, revenues, lives, liberties, and every thing that is near and dear to us, ſubſervient to the abſolute will and caprice of one man, *the principle of freedom* is forgot, and the revolution is fundamentally ſubverted.

It is perpetually dinned in our ears, You muſt not contract the influence of the Crown, becauſe the Revolution created it. I will not endeavour to interrupt the ingenious advocates of the court ſyſtem in their attempts to perſuade us, that the oppreſſion of the day is to be borne, becauſe at ſome other time, and in ſome other circumſtance, it was not felt as an oppreſſion. Men will throw off in the dog-days thoſe ſuperfluous and cumbrous cloaks, which were no more than ſufficient to maintain the vital heat in another ſeaſon of

the year. But I leave theſe gentlemen to kick againſt the pricks, and to argue down the univerſal ſenſe and feelings of mankind. I ſpeak to the enlightened conſciences of the Whigs of England; and I tell them, that if corrupt influence is indeed a creature of the revolution, and if it thwarts the purpoſes of the revolution, the way to worſhip the revolution is to deſtroy the influence.

There is a natural imperfection, and principle of decay woven into the texture of man, and all his works. He who ſows the corn, ſows the tares along with it. But ſhall we ſuffer the noxious weed to ſtifle the wholeſome plant, becauſe the ſame hand ſowed them both?—We ſhall ſhow a true veneration for our patriot anceſtors, by reſpecting in them what they reſpected in themſelves. They placed but little confidence in inſtitutions: let us do the ſame. They cultivated a principle of freedom: let us do the ſame. Let us teſtify our obligations, not by a blind and ſuperſtitious adoration of their uſeleſs reliques; of their mortal, periſhable, corruptible, and imperfect parts; but by infuſing into all our thoughts and actions thoſe enlarged and liberal ideas, which form the incorruptible eſſence and immortal ſoul of the Revolution.

While our anceſtors were reſiſting prerogative with the ſame ſpirit that we oppoſe

to influence, we may be ſure that the courtiers of that day defended their abuſes by the example of ſome great character, from whoſe hand prerogative received its origin, as well as its increaſe. The Ruſſels, the Devonſhires, the Lockes, the Somers's, and the Godolphins, then anſwered. We honour the wiſdom of thoſe patriotic legiſlators, who ſupported, in feudal times, a principle congenial to the feudal ſyſtem. They encouraged prejudices, perhaps not more than neceſſary to ſoften the fury of barbarous ages. It was perhaps impoſſible, at that time, to keep ſociety together, without ſurrounding the throne with the myſterious uncertainty of an undefined and undefinable prerogative. The reaſons of theſe inſtitutions are long ſince gone: let the inſtitutions periſh with them.

As reſpectable names as thoſe to whom we owe the revolution, at this day, will anſwer —Though our anceſtors were well aware of the unconſtitutional tendency of the influence of the crown, they were obliged to avail themſelves of the intereſted diſpoſition of mankind, in order to maintain the revolution. *A foreign King, and an unſettled government*, compelled them to become the ſupporters of a corrupt influence, for whoſe extirpation they relied on the virtue of their poſterity. And ſhall we, who have the happineſs to

enjoy the bleſſings of the preſent reign, inſult a Sovereign, who, *born and bred amongſt us, glories in the name of Briton*, and who ſits enthroned in the affections of his ſubjects, by an injurious ſuppoſition, that ſuch baſe, extrinſic aids are in the leaſt neceſſary to ſupport *his* government. I hope the repoſe of our Sovereign is not diſturbed by any ſuch reflections. If it is, I offer that great perſonage my humble recommendation, to relieve his royal mind from the anxious cares which obſtruct the free operation of his patriotiſm, in the contemplation of this undoubted truth: —That not all the honours, and all the bribes of a prodigal court; that not all the douceurs of all the eſtabliſhments, which the prolific abuſes of ſucceſſive ages have accumulated; that not all the ſums, with which his dutiful Commons have over-ſtrained their own venality, to inflate his treaſuries, are of power to extract from the hearts of his loving ſubjects one prayer more, for a long continuance of that glorious order and ſeries of happy years, which has followed his aſcenſion to the throne of his anceſtors, and with which a new æra has begun to take its courſe in the hiſtory of the Britiſh nation.

THE

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

To Lord N——h.

MY LORD, *April* 10, 1780.

ARE you to be told that the repentant vote of the Houſe of Commons (of *April* 6,) which acknowledged *the increaſed and increaſing influence of the Crown* was the ſentence of your *final* condemnation. Such was it conſidered within doors, as ſuch was it received, in all the extravagance of joy and mutual congratulation by the people at large. It acknowledged that *now*, at this advanced period of your adminiſtration, *it was neceſſary* for the ſalvation of this country; *neceſſary* for the preſervation of all that your councils have left of the empire; *neceſſary* for the protection of our rights and privileges; *neceſſary* for the very exiſtence of our conſtitution, to declare to the people that the accuſation they had brought againſt your ſyſtem of government was juſt and well-founded;—that the influence of the Crown had *now*, under your actual and immediate auſpices, encreaſed to ſuch an alarming height, as to require an immediate and effectual check—ſuch a check as the petitions of one hundred thouſand

freeholders, lying upon the table, ſupplicated at the hands of their repreſentatives.

We are *now authentically* put in poſſeſſion of the mighty ſecret by which you have ſucceeded for a ſeries of years paſt in defeating every ſalutary attempt to reſcue this country from ruin. The cauſe is *confeſſed* that has enabled you to enforce the deſtructive meaſures by which you have brought us to our preſent diſgraceful and deſperate ſtate. If Parliament have ſervilely acquieſced in all the raſh and impolitic councils which you propoſed to their conſideration, previous to the American war, and which drove the coloniſts to arms—if they have betrayed the truſt repoſed in them by their conſtituents, and given their ſanction to the frantic ſchemes by which you have hitherto conducted that unnatural conteſt; if, in oppoſition to the many *acknowledged* proofs of your duplicity and breach of faith, to the repeated *confeſſions* of your ignorance, and want of foreſight, of information, of becoming diffidence and caution in truſting to the profeſſions of our ancient and natural enemies, they have conſtantly profeſſed to place an implicit confidence in all your aſſertions; if they ſaw that your whole ſtudy, your whole buſineſs in Parliament, was to make daily apologies for daily errors, daily to defend your conduct againſt the attacks which the accumulated

loſſes and defeats that invariably diſgraced all your plans of operation, daily brought upon you from the friends of the conſtitution and ſtate, and yet voted that the government could not be placed in better hands; if they continued to laviſh the public treaſures in ſatisfying your unbounded extortions, without requiring either meaſure or account; if they ſet their faces againſt every attempt to examine into the public expenditure, and ſcouted every information that could lead to a detection of your criminal prodigality, notwithſtanding the damning proofs that were repeatedly laid before them; if theſe and other numberleſs inſtances of their tameneſs and acquieſcence have ſo long ſtruck the public with aſtoniſhment and indignation, we are now, from their own *confeſſion*, ſatisfied of the cauſe. They have acknowledged the powerful charm by which you contrived to faſcinate their underſtandings, to blind their judgments, and to blunt their feelings. For this acknowledgment the public give them credit. They receive the atonement as far as it goes; they accept from their hands the ſcape-goat that is preſented to them for expiation, and are content that you alone ſhall bear all their ſins and offences on your devoted head.

The Houſe of Commons have taken part with the people againſt you; even your very

very life-guards, the creatures of your corruption, who owe their exiſtence to your prodigality, waver in their attachment. They caſt many a longing look towards the ſtandard of your enemies. The freeholders of England anticipated the ſentence of their repreſentatives; they dictated the very expreſſions that have been adopted to ſtigmatiſe your adminiſtration: and yet you hope that you ſhall eſcape unpuniſhed! not only hope to eſcape unpuniſhed, but you brazen the public in all the ſecurity of office; truſted, careſſed, employed by your Sovereign, as his confidential ſervant, and admitted into a cloſer intimacy, and a higher degree of favour, from the general deteſtation that purſues you.

Beware, my Lord, I have once before hinted to you in the courſe of theſe letters, that your hopes of ſupport from the throne muſt terminate in diſappointment; as long as there appears a determination in the royal breaſt to keep you in office at all events, you will not fail to find numbers to join you upon queſtions that do not notoriouſly claſh with the petitions of the people. But it is the advice of ſcripture—"Put not your truſt in Princes." Can you flatter yourſelf that your gracious maſter will riſque—I tremble to mention what he muſt riſque—in taking a decided part againſt his ſubjects with a Miniſter

Miniſter whom they execrate, and a government which they abhor? Can you flatter yourſelf that he will obſtinately perſevere even to the laſt ſtake, in a conteſt in which he has every thing to loſe, and nothing to gain?

The vote of laſt Thurſday (*April* 6), ſhould at length open his eyes; it ſhould convince him how ineffectual that power, which he has been adviſed to eſtabliſh by ſyſtem ſince the very commencement of his reign, muſt ever prove againſt the declared ſentiments and peremptory demands of his ſubjects. He ſhould learn from it which voice the repreſentatives of this country muſt, in the long run, be forced to obey; the voice of their conſtituents, or that of the chief magiſtrate, when their intereſts are unfortunately placed in competition.

The experience of that day, and temper of the preſent moment, ſhould teach him the fallacy of that maxim which he has ſo long heard inculcated to him, "*that it is no matter who is Miniſter: let him but chooſe one, and it is of little conſequence whether the creature of his choice have any connexions with the ſentiments and opinions of the people or not.* By continuing you in office after the reſult of Thurſday's debate, his ſubjects ſuſpect that he means to come to iſſue with them upon that alarming queſtion. Your appearance

ance in the Houſe of Commons ſtill entruſted as firſt Miniſter, gives jealouſies that this unconſtitutional maxim is, at this very hour, upon trial. Would to God he may reflect in time that its truth or flattery may be finally determined, not by cabinet whiſpers, not by courtly doctrines, not by the cunning ſuggeſtions of flatterers and ſycophants, but by the feelings, but by the innate conviction and ſpontaneous determinations of an inſulted people.

At their honeſt tribunal your Scottiſh advocate will find but little credit for his metaphyſical diſtinctions. He will gain but few proſelytes by his quibbles between queſtions of fact, and queſtions, that from their conſtruction, may be conſidered as abſtract and undefined. No war of words, *no ſhuffling, bribing there*; his ſophiſtry will be as unintelligible to the underſtandings of Engliſh freeholders, as his barbarous accents would be harſh and grating to their ears. It is ſome conſolation to them, my Lord, to hear that the only man who *ſteps forth* to defend your cauſe muſt employ another language, beſides the Engliſh, to defend it, and that his terms are as foreign to the idiom of our native tongue, as his tenets are to our conſtitution.

But perhaps your Lordſhip's great hope is founded in another favourite maxim of your adminiſtration; to divide the people; to ſet the

the national party at variance with itſelf. You flatter yourſelf that appearances juſtify this hope. The promoters of the petitions began by attacking your adminiſtration; they now begin to be divided among themſelves, and are proceeding rapidly to open oppoſition.

Here again I will venture to aſſure your Lordſhip, that you will find yourſelf deceived in your expectations. However the friends of the conſtitution may differ in *ſpeculative* opinions as to the *modes* of reformation, they are all perfectly agreed as to the *neceſſity* of a reformation—of an immediate, effectual reformation, extending to all our grievances, competent to the cure of all our diſquietudes.

In this *one eſſential point* the views of all center. And ſurely, my Lord, you have reaſon to tremble at the proceſs of their efforts to attain that point. They have begun by diſcovering the ſource of the evil—They have authenticated it by the voice of Parliament—They have ſat down before it, and will ſtick to it till they have removed it effectually. —THE CORRUPT INFLUENCE OF THE CROWN *now* acknowledged to have worked its way into every department of the State, into every corner and cranny of the kingdom, was the primary object of all their meetings—it is ſtill the chief object of all their aſſociations. No artifice, no cunning of their enemies can diſtract their attention till that influence ſhall receive

receive an effectual, permanent check—TILL THE GOVERNMENT THAT HAS SWELLED ITS SOURCE, AND ENCREASED ITS CHANNELS TO THEIR PRESENT DESTRUCTIVE DIMENSIONS AND EXTENT SHALL BE FIRST REFORMED, AND ITS MEMBERS REMOVED.

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

To Lord North.

MY LORD, *April* 13, 1780.

THE table of the Houſe of Commons has preſented, for ſome days paſt, a ſpectacle that cannot fail of being grateful to every Engliſhman. At length, we ſee it purified, and reſtored to the pious uſes to which it was originally conſecrated. It is become once more THE ALTAR OF THE PEOPLE. Piled with their ſacred inſtructions, their Miniſters look up to it as to the ſhrine from which we all expect our ſalvation. They attend to them with awe, with veneration, with deference; and, animated by their inſpiring voice, are ſtrenuouſly demoliſhing the idolatrous groves, and polluted temples, which concealed the accurſed rites that have drawn upon us the wrath of Heaven.

Still, however, you continue to hold your ſeat

ſeat on the Treaſury-Bench; ſtill you appear determined to brave and ſet at defiance the unabating zeal of your conſtant opponents, no leſs than the repentant virtue of your former aſſociates.

Your friends make this their boaſt; all good men fear it, and tremble at the conſequences. The people are inſolently told, that they muſt not think their triumph complete. They may pull down the temple of Corruption; but the high-prieſt bids them defiance. Not a hair of your head ſhall be touched. We ſhall carry what queſtions we pleaſe, provided we keep clear of every direct attack on your ſacred perſon.—*Atrox in plebem, et implacabilis, plebeiorum, magiſtratuum jus libimet arrogas, nec SACROSANCTUM tete dubitas effere.* If once we venture upon that daring attack, we ſhall find how vain are all our hopes of ſucceſs. We ſhall ſee what numbers of thoſe, in whoſe aſſiſtance we place our reliance, will abandon us, and croud to your ſupport.

Thoſe ſanguine friends of your Lordſhip have already proved falſe prophets. In this inſtance, alſo, I will venture to ſet my poor power of divination in oppoſition to theirs. I have better ſigns to augur from than ſelfiſh hopes and intereſted wiſhes. I have the honour, the feelings, the ſenſe of ſhame, and the pride of conſiſtency in the two hundred and thirty-three members who ſided with the people

people againſt you on the 6th of this month. Is there a man of that number who can have the face to ſupport you after the vote of that day?

How ſtand they pledged as gentlemen, as members of parliament? They have acknowledged that *now*, under your actual direction and immediate auſpices, the corrupt influence of the crown has encreaſed to ſo alarming a height as to require an immediate and effectual check. With what face, then, can they ſupport the miniſter who, under the preſſure of that vote, muſt ſtand condemned of having ſquandered the public treaſures, and plundered the people in acquiring and diffuſing that influence?

Is there upon record a ſingle inſtance of ſo flagitious a charge being brought home to any adminiſtration, of ſo ignominious a ſentence being paſſed upon any miniſter in all the annals of our hiſtory? And can the men who confirmed that charge, and pronounced that ſentence againſt the ſyſtem of *your* adminiſtration, be the men to ſupport you in office?

But ſhould we be deceived in the good opinion we have formed of them—Should they refuſe to honour that credit which the public has thus generouſly given them for their late proceedings, ſtill, my Lord, we are far from relinquiſhing our hopes of ſucceſs. The bitter conſequences of a temporary and fallacious

fallacious triumph muſt, in the reſult, prove your Lordſhip's portion. They can never fall on the friends of this country. THE DETERMINED VIRTUE OF THE PEOPLE aſſerting their OWN CAUSE IS OUR SHEET ANCHOR. To their ſpirited interference we are indebted for the conceſſions that have been already made, and for the formal confeſſion of the great evil againſt which they framed their complaints. To that interference we expect to be indebted for the redreſs of that evil, and for the removal of the wicked Miniſters, under whoſe ma[redacted]ment it hath ariſen to its preſent alarming e[redacted]ſs.

In ſimilar ſtruggles between the ſpirit of the conſtitution, and the profligacy of the court, that interference never failed of ſucceſs. It has ſometimes reached beyond the ſacrifice of Miniſters. It has forced its way in blood to the throne. Left to your own councils; indulged in the full proſecution of that ſyſtem, which from your continuance in office, we have but too juſt reaſon to ſuſpect, is now profeſſedly adopted in a quarter, from whence *alone* you derive your ſupport, there is little doubt but you would ſhortly renew that tragical ſcene, with all its concomitant horrors. But here again our great hope is in the *determined virtue of the people*. Their manly perſeverance in the legal, conſtitutional, and peaceful ſtruggle they have commenced,

will

will prove our ſureſt ſafeguard againſt the pernicious conſequences of your raſh impolitic councils, and of the fatal predilection that ſeems determined to pit you againſt the people.

This ſhall be our only armour of *defence*; and is it, my Lord, in the native indolence, weakneſs, and inconſiſtency of your character, is it in the recorded cowardice of a G—e, in the ignorance and imbecility of a H——h, in the craft and timid ſubtlety of a M——d, in the luxurious, debilitated profligacy of a S——h, or in the concealed machinations, and lurking aſſaſſin-like plottings of a B—e, to reduce us to circumſtances that could force us from our moderation, or drive us into exceſſes ſubverſive of our internal quiet and happineſs?

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

May 2, 1780.

IT is not ſurpriſing, that the ſituation of this country, and the rapid progreſs of our domeſtic diſſenſions, ſhould ſpread ſuch univerſal terror and apprehenſion throughout the kingdom. A fearful expectation of immediate, impending evils is univerſally gone abroad, and men begin to prepare their minds

minds to meet them in their worſt forms. Suſpicions of the deſpotic intentions of Miniſters are every hour giving way to proofs. What was yeſterday ſurmiſe becomes this day certainty. We can no longer ſolace ourſelves with even the negative conſolation of doubting the dangers with which we are threatened. From covert wiles, and ſecret machinations, the enemies of the conſtitution have proceeded to the moſt daring acts of avowed hoſtility. They ſcorn the little war of ambuſh, undermining and ſtratagem, to which they have hitherto confined themſelves. They feel themſelves in force to meet us on our ſtrongeſt ground, and confident of their powers, ſeem determined to cut off all hopes of accommodation, by infuſing into the quarrel, between king and people, all the poiſonous fermenting mixtures of inſult, contempt, and mockery.

The breach widens every hour. Obſtinacy on one ſide ſwells in proportion to juſt reſentment on the other. Raſh, precipitate, imperious, arbitrary Counſellors, regardleſs of the fatal examples of former times, unmindful of the recent calamities they have themſelves, by a ſimilar conduct, entailed upon their country, ſurround the throne, and ſhut up every avenue to experience, wiſdom, moderation, ſelf-intereſt, decency.

The prayers of the people find their way

into Parliament only to provoke additional mortifications and inſults. Their complaints are admitted to be juſt and well founded only to be denied redreſs. Their petitions are ſnatched from the hands of the honeſt members who introduced, cheriſhed, and ſupported them, and are inſolently taken up, under pretence of complying with their object, by a ſet of men who have repeatedly ſpurned and contemned them as factious, and the baſe ſpawn of ſedition. No meaſures originating from the friends to the petitioners, however adequate to their object, or conſonant to our wiſhes, muſt ever hope for ſucceſs. They alarm the *integrity*, they ſhock the *patriotiſm* and *public ſpirit* of government. Miniſters, in their *great love for the people*, appropriate to themſelves the care of leſſening the miſeries they have brought upon us, and expect that we ſhall reſt contented with the aſſurances they have condeſcended to give us, that ſomething *may yet be done* to afford us content. North takes the place of the Burkes and the Dunnings. The Sicilians muſt look for redreſs to Verres.

By whom, then, are our prayers henceforth to be attended to? By thoſe who from the firſt have reprobated them as the dictates of party and faction. By whom are our grievances henceforth to be redreſſed? By thoſe who have contended, and who ſtill contend,

contend, that they only exiſt in the diſtempered viſions, and frantic ravings of popular madneſs. Who is to enquire henceforth into the public expenditure? Who is to correct the crying abuſes and enormities that have impoveriſhed the State? The very men who ſtand accuſed of theſe enormities, and upon whom they have been proved by irrefragable teſtimonies. Who are henceforth to aboliſh the ſinecure places, unmerited penſions, and exorbitant emoluments of office which abſorb the public treaſures, and embezzle the funds that ſhould be appropriated to the exigencies of the war? The very men who enjoy thoſe places and penſions, and who fatten on the ſpoils drained from the confined, crippled, exhauſted induſtry of the people. Who is to reſtrain the corrupt influence of the crown, to which we owe all our ſufferings? Who is to prevent the ruin with which the very exiſtence of the empire is threatened from its acknowledged increaſe? The men who have proved themſelves the moſt abject ſlaves, the very vileſt drudges of that influence; who by their conſiſtency in venality and corruption have oppoſed the public conviction, and denied its exiſtence, or who by their baſe, treacherous, diſgraceful tergiverſation, by their breach of public faith, and the ſacrifice of every thing that is held ſacred or binding in ſociety, have proved its baneful power

beyond all former proſtitution, beyond even the memorable vote that confeſſes their recorded infamy.

Theſe are the men to whom we muſt now look up for redreſs. In their hands alone is our ſafety, our happineſs, our redemption. Their word is the breath of our exiſtence. Their will is our fate. No other interference, or interceſſion, can avail us. No virtue, no abilities, no integrity, no independence, no confidence on our ſide, no fidelity on the part of our approved and entruſted friends. This would be idolatry againſt thoſe gods of government. An invocation of the martyrs and confeſſors of liberty, againſt which they point all the thunders of the cabinet*.

If this ſolemn mockery on our underſtanding, this outrage on our beſt feelings, could receive any aggravation, it would be from the circumſtances that attended this triumph of the Miniſter over the people of England. He choſe the brighteſt moment of our hopes, he availed himſelf of the very vote of the 6th of April, to impreſs us with proper ſentiments of the ſtrength and power of the Crown, and of the ſlavery to which he meant to make us bend our necks.

* This appearance of ſomething popiſh in the proceedings of the petitioners has alarmed the Chairman of the Proteſtant Aſſociation, and is ſaid to be the cauſe of his defection to the Miniſter.

Our

Our complaints had that night been acknowledged to be juſt and well founded. Our repreſentatives confeſſed that the influence of the crown had increaſed to the extent and danger we had repreſented, and that it called aloud for that immediate and effectual check which was the object of our petitions. The expectations we conceived from this appearance of the returning integrity of Parliament, were confirmed by repeated votes of the Houſe. With the moſt unſuſpecting confidence, the counties began immediately to aſſume a milder tone. They withheld their aſſociations, and adopted leſs reſolute meaſures in the certainty of procuring redreſs from the faithful guardians of their freedom and poſſeſſions.

But a ſingle day convinced them that all this was mockery, colluſion, the blackeſt confirmation of all their ſuſpicions, a hopeleſs aſſurance that all expectations from any power but their own muſt end in diſappointment. The Miniſter entered his VETO againſt all further proceedings in their favour, and neither the ſenſe of duty, the pride of conſiſtency, the calls of honour, the upbraidings of conſcience, nor the remembrance of the faith they had ſolemnly pledged to their conſtituents, to one another, each of them individually to himſelf could influence

the

the apoſtates from the majority of 233 to give it oppoſition.

The infamy was not confined to the Lower Houſe. Orders were iſſued to the Lords to aſſiſt in this ſcandalous attack on the conſtitution, which it was the pride of their birth-right, and the boaſt of their independence to maintain in its proper balance and proportion. A majority was found among them baſe enough to make atonement to the *King's friends* for the momentary virtue of the other Aſſembly. They conſented to bear the odium of with-holding from the people that redreſs with which their own repreſentatives had conſented to gratify them, and by that denial held themſelves up to the contempt and ſcorn of the world as ſlaves purchaſed by the treaſures of their country to ſupport that influence againſt which their country had conſtituted them guardians by inheritance.

Thus are the people reduced at once to abſolute deſperation. Every tongue that could plead for them is ſilenced. Every friendly hand that could reſcue them from deſtruction is fettered and diſarmed; they are told that they have no reſource under Heaven in which they can truſt, except the *generoſity and candour* of their profeſſed enemies. If they look to their repreſentatives, they meet with mockery and inſult. From their hereditary guardians they have ſtill leſs to hope.

They

They find themſelves in the deplorable ſtate of their oppreſſed anceſtors, the Barbarians drive them to the ſea, the ſea forces them back upon the Barbarians. The ſervants of the crown make a ſpectacle of their diſtreſſes. They taunt while they crucify them, "ye have truſted in others, can they ſave you?" And then, in all the fulſome ſtrains of Court adulation, call upon them to truſt to the patriotiſm, to the love for his people, to the anxiety for their welfare and happineſs, to the feeling for their diſtreſſes, to the willingneſs he has at all times teſtified to receive their complaints, and redreſs their grievances that diſtinguiſh their amiable Sovereign, at the very inſtant that they ſtretch all his authority and influence to the utmoſt, in oppoſing their wiſhes, and violating their rights.

From theſe conſiderations, which naturally ſuggeſt themſelves on a review of the facts that have taken place within this laſt month, the well affected to the peace of this country find reaſon to form the moſt alarming apprehenſions; on one ſide they ſee an obſtinate invincible determination in the Court to eſtabliſh their ſyſtem, at all hazards, on the ſufferings of the people; on the other they ſee the ancient ſpirit of the nation rouſing itſelf, ſlowly indeed, and cautiouſly, but with a ſteady reſolution and deliberate purpoſe,

infinitely

infinitely more formidable than the moſt violent ſtarts of ſudden and momentary indignation.

A compariſon between the preſent and former days, and the recent tranſactions of our own period, ſerve to encreaſe thoſe fears. The Miniſterial advocates need not take ſuch pains in their ſpeeches to remind us of the commencement of our civil diſſenſions in the reign of the obſtinate and infatuated Charles. Their own conduct ſets thoſe unhappy times in proſpect before us in colours infinitely more forcible, and of a blacker hue than all the deſcriptive eloquence of their new proſelytes, or their hoary veterans. They have hitherto repreſented the bloody ſcene at a diſtance. The fifth act promiſes to bring our own mangled rights on the ſtage, and to cloſe the tragedy.

I am not one of thoſe who preſume to ſit in the throne of Providence, and account for his decrees. I do not dare to ſpecify his puniſhments, or pronounce his viſitations to be the conſequences of particular crimes. But if ever he inflicted national calamities as a judgment on national violence and injuſtice, he now threatens to bring the curſe to our doors. AMERICA had long patiently borne the grievances with which ſhe was oppreſſed. Not all the tyrannical eſſays of the then newly eſtabliſhed ſyſtem of

deſpotiſm

deſpotiſm could force her into exceſſes deſtructive of her allegiance. After a martyrdom of years, ſhe at length ventured to ſpeak her grievances: ſhe bottomed her conduct on the principles of the conſtitution: ſhe *petitioned* in all the humble forms of loyalty and affectionate obedience: ſhe only claimed the acknowledged rights of Britiſh freemen: ſhe too received a partial hearing. An extorted enquiry was made into the grounds of her complaints; witneſſes were called to the bar of Parliament to prove the juſtice of her prayers—but the whole ended *then* as *now* in *mockery* and *inſult*. Her complaints were rejected with contumely; her grievances were doubled. She was driven to make her appeal to the Supreme Lawgiver, and to bare her boſom to the ſword, and her head to the ſcalping knife, in defence of her rights. It is the boaſt and plea of the Miniſter, that this war on the liberties of our fellow-ſubjects was a *popular* war. The oppoſition who reprobated it was an *unpopular* oppoſition. It had the ſanction of the *Country Gentlemen*, it had the voice of the people. If he be authoriſed to make this boaſt,—if the Engliſh nation be party in his cauſe, I have only to add the obſervation of the poet, *Neque lex eſt juſtior ulla, quam necis artifices arte perire ſuâ.*

Againſt theſe horrid apprehenſions, I con-

feſs, I ſee but one reſource. If we find it at all, it muſt be in the cool, deliberate, but inflexible virtue of the people. Fortunately the circumſtances of the times are favourable to our hopes. All our expectations *within* Parliament, are now at an end. The rejection of Mr. Dunning's motions, with the circumſtances that attended that rejection, and the fate of Mr. Burke's bill, have ſhut thoſe doors againſt us for ever. All our exertions muſt henceforth be made *without*. The general election is at hand. It will then remain with the people to redreſs themſelves by a choice of proper repreſentatives for a future Parliament. Let them be but true to themſelves on that occaſion, and there is as yet no power in this kingdom to break or diſturb their peace, much leſs to triumph finally over their liberties.

In the mean time they muſt not ſuffer themſelves to be divided or ſplit into parties. To divide firſt, and then to conquer, is the maxim on which their enemies ground all their hopes of ſucceſs. Amongſt theſe there is the moſt perfect unanimity. To continue to govern by influence and corruption, is the chief point they have in view, as that on which their whole ſyſtem hinges. To ſecure it againſt every actual attack, they croud round it with all their force, without quarrelling about the means to ſecure it in future.

Speculative

Speculative men, of warm fancies and honeſt intentions, but little converſant in the world, and judging all things eaſy to their wiſhes, from their inexperience of the difficulties and oppoſitions they muſt meet from the paſſions and intereſts of mankind, and from diverſity of opinions, even among the beſt, are often apt to injure the cauſe they mean to advance. Their hot and fiery zeal, diſdaining the curb of diſcretion or experience, darts beyond the line. It hurries them on imperceptibly; and they would rather renounce the prize they contend for, than not carry it all at once.

In every ſyſtem of reformation we muſt proceed by ſlow and cautious ſteps. We cannot hope all at once to cut away the cords of prejudice and habitual attachments, that bind many well diſpoſed perſons even to abuſes that have had the ſanction of time. We muſt gain men over by degrees. We muſt begin by the moſt obvious and acknowledged evils, till having carried our approaches gradually to the great fortreſſes of corruption, we may batter them down with greater certainty and eaſe, and then in peace together, and with joint deliberation erect the duly harmonized and well proportioned fabric of laſting reformation.

[*The laſt paragraph but one, in the preceding Paper, gave great offence to* Major JOHN CARTWRIGHT, *who had written ſeveral tracts upon the ſubjects of Annual Parliaments, and Univerſal Suffrage; and had been, with* Dr. JOHN JEBB, *and others, one of the principal founders and ſupporters of a Club, who called themſelves* The Society for Conſtitutional Information. *Mr. Cartwright thought proper to write an anſwer to this paragraph.* ——*The following is a copy of his Anſwer.*]

May 6, 1780.

"MUCH as I reſpect the principles, and admire the talents of THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN, I cannot but feel ſome little doubt as to the application of, and entertain ſome fears of ill effect from, the latter part of his letter. If he would point out that deſcription of perſons whom, amongſt the oppoſers of the preſent wicked Miniſters, he deſigns by "ſpeculative men, of warm "fancies and honeſt intentions, but little "converſant in the world," and enter into a temperate, candid diſcuſſion of thoſe *opinions* he attributes to them, as a ſource from which he ſeems to apprehend a diviſion amongſt the friends of the people, poſſibly it might promote that union he recommends, far more than a profound ſilence upon the ſuppoſed points

points in diſpute, accompanied by imputations of "hot and fiery zeal, diſdaining the "curb of diſcretion and experience," to thoſe from whom he differs in ſentiment.

As he had only *hinted*, I ſhall ſtand excuſed if I fall into any error, in imagining the "ſpeculative men" he alludes to, are the preſent *open* and ſteady advocates for *annual parliaments and an equal repreſentation*. If I have erred, I am ready to apologize; but as I conceive thoſe are the perſons pointed to, with his permiſſion, and with as anxious a wiſh for *unanimity* as can inſpire his or any boſom, I will once more offer my ſentiments upon the ſubject.

With much ſubmiſſion, I cannot ſee how that thread-bare obſervation, "To divide firſt, and then conquer," can in the preſent inſtance be applied. It is not the *Miniſter* who cauſes this diviſion between the contenders for annual parliaments, and thoſe amongſt the oppoſition who are for a longer term. How then is the obſervation applicable? Do the many "well diſpoſed perſons" who are bound "by the cords of prejudice "and habitual attachments to abuſes" in our government, that is to ſay, to ſeptennial or triennial parliaments, and a mock repreſentation, think it reaſonable that the ſincere friends of reformation ſhould ſuffer themſelves to be tongue-tied, and to ſacrifice perhaps

haps the only opportunity that may ever occur for ſaving their country, for the ſake of unanimity *with men attached to the very abuſes which have proved our ruin*, however ſtrong their prejudices may be? And are theſe men who are thus *bound by the cords of prejudice*, and ſo *attached to theſe abuſes*, to be held up to us, as the oracles by whoſe wiſdom and virtue we are alone to be ſaved? And are thoſe who ſacrifice every prejudice, and who make a manly and honeſt appeal to *the conſtitution of our country*, and that which was the ſalutary *practice* of our anceſtors for *many hundred years*, to be ſneered into contempt, as "ſpeculative men little con-" verſant in the world, whoſe hot and fiery " zeal diſdains the curb of *diſcretion* and " *experience*, and who would rather renounce " the prize they contend for, than not carry " it *all at once?*"

I know not with what intentions THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN writes; I hope with the pureſt: but I muſt obſerve, that this language appears to me only calculated to ſerve a party, by the very extraordinary propoſal, that THE PEOPLE OF ENGLAND, and every unprejudiced friend of the conſtitution, ſhall ſacrifice the only ſecurity they can have for their freedom, to the prejudices of that party and its attachments to ruinous abuſes; and upon theſe terms unite in raiſing them

them into power. For my own part, I never ſhall be ſilenced by ſuch arguments, nor will I ever conſent to ſuch terms; and highly as I eſtimate many of the party alluded to, for their abilities and many virtues, yet I have not a conception that there is not wiſdom and virtue enough in this nation, completely to reform its rotten government, and recover its freedom without their aſſiſtance, if they will not caſt away thoſe prejudices in favour of long parliaments, rotten boroughs, and miniſterial influence over a Houſe of Commons, notwithſtanding ſuch abuſes "have "had the ſanction of time," which make the only blemiſh in their public characters that I know of.

With reſpect to the carrying of the prize we contend for *all at once*, that I maintain to be the only mode of proceeding that will turn out either *prudent*, *politic*, or *practicable*. Had the friends of freedom at the Revolution done their buſineſs *all at once*, we had now been in as great danger of deſpotiſm, as they were in before they expelled James; and if our work be not done *all at once*, it will not be done at all. By *all at once*, I mean, that all that is *eſſential* to ſecure *the freedom of the people*, viz. a complete repreſentation in annual parliaments, together with their proper ſecurities, muſt be gained by the people's *firſt effort*, or they will not be gained in this century,

century, and probably never. This muſt be *one ſtep*, becauſe *no repreſentative body will make ſuch a reform*, and it muſt be the act of *the people*. It is not for a great nation, rouſed to do itſelf right, to mince and fritter its reforms into ſcraps and unfiniſhed fragments, but, what is *eſſential*, to do *all at once*. This is *the firſt ſtep*, the foundation of neceſſary reformation. This, effected by themſelves, their repreſentatives may then, *and not till then*, be truſted to perform the reſt, and then they will, becauſe they *muſt*, perform it.

Unanimity upon ſuch ground as ſeems to be recommended by THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN, would *not* anſwer the hopes of *the people*; ſuch unanimity would not reſtore independency to Parliament, nor terminate in erecting "the duty harmonized and well "proportioned fabric of laſting reformation;" neither do I believe that it would be for the intereſt even of the very party whoſe advocates ſo warmly recommend it. They are proſcribed at court, with an inveteracy which nothing but *the unanimity of the people firſt, and the independency of parliament* afterwards, can conquer. Were they even to ſucceed in obtaining that unanimity in their favour, it would avail them nothing, if they vainly truſted to *the management* of a Houſe of Commons, by their miniſterial influence, for preſerving their power. Nothing but a perfect

fect independency in that houſe, and a full conviction out of doors, of their being the friends of the people, could poſſibly ſupport them againſt a rooted love of deſpotic ſway, and a ſettled hatred of the principles they profeſs in the interior of interiors.

Let them, then, ſhew their deſire of unanimity, by joining the *millions*, inſtead of requiring the millions to join them. All the *people* deſire, is to have their conſtitution reſtored to them; ſo that, by the free uninfluenced ſuffrages of *all*, and *annual* elections, they may henceforth hold their property, their lives, and their freedom, by the equal laws of their country, and not at the *diſcretion* of even the beſt and wiſeſt men alive. And it is even an inſuperable objection to the people's exerting themſelves to place certain men in power, that when they were laſt in that ſituation they could not hold it, for want of the means which I have pointed out; ſo that, to do that alone, would only be to expoſe them to be again betrayed, and to delude ourſelves.

A SPECULATOR *in a Great Chair.*"

[*This letter of* Mr. Cartwright's *raiſed the choler of* Mr. Richard Burke, *the Son (not the brother) of* Mr. Edmund Burke. *He*

wrote the following Reply to Mr. Cartwright's *letter.*]

May 9, 1780.

"A Writer who ſigns himſelf, A Speculator in a Great Chair, ſeems diſpleaſed that THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN ſhould deſcribe in the following manner a ſet of perſons who call themſelves advocates for EQUAL REPRESENTATION AND ANNUAL PARLIAMENTS. He calls them, "ſpeculative men of warm fancies and honeſt intentions, but little converſant in the world." I will give another deſcription of theſe perſons, which will ſtrike them more forcibly, though it may not pleaſe them better. They are

"*A ſet of perſons, unknowing and almoſt unknown by the world; few in number, and contemptible in character; without fortune, rank, or public eſtimation; having never ſtood in any ſituation of public truſt, becauſe no man would ever truſt them. Supplying the defect of ability and experience, by ſelf-ſufficiency, arrogance and obſtinacy,* they purſue *A ſcheme of government which never did nor ever can exiſt, and which is fundamentally oppoſite to the principles of the Engliſh conſtitution.* Grown in a manner frantic and wild with deſperate malignity, they are determined, *to trample upon all the ability and virtue of England, and to ſacrifice* the peace, the happineſs, the deareſt intereſts, and even the conſtitution of

their

their country, *to the chimeras of their own extravagant imaginations.*

" Here is a character which the world will recogniſe whenever natural inſignificancy is ſuperſeded by the reſtleſs and active inſolence of vice and folly. To endeavour to counteract the baneful operation of evil induſtry, to illuſtrate, to exemplify, to prove, to make out all the parts of a character whoſe outline I have traced, is a taſk no leſs uſeful than it is laborious.—Indignation will inſpire when ability is wanting.

" A liſt of thoſe perſons who arrogate to themſelves the title of The People, and who with ſo much modeſty claim the diſpoſal of honour, profit and power, will be highly entertaining to the public. When laughter ſubſides, the people will riſe up in anger to puniſh the audacious temerity of thoſe who have dared to aſſume ſuch a reſpectable name.

" Thoſe who have ſacrificed every motive of intereſt, and even honourable ambition to an attachment to duty and a love of their country; who are proſcribed at Court on account of the people; who are martyrs to the cauſe of the people, have too long permitted their characters to be ſlurred, and their reputation to be pilfered by men who have ſacrificed no ambition, and had none to ſacrifice. The head has too long been guided by the tail.—A blind adder is little qualified

to lead the generous ſpirit of an injured people. Are there no men capable of ſerving the State with fidelity to the conſtitution? If there are, why ſhould virtue be aſhamed? Let honeſt men boldly come forward, to claim *the reward of virtue*, which is *public confidence;* the people will open their arms to receive them.

"*A Friend to honeſt Men.*"

[*After this altercation*, The Country Gentleman *wrote only one letter more; which was the following.*]

THE COUNTRY GENTLEMAN.

May 28, 1780.

THE temper of the times is ſuch as to diſcourage every man, who does not find new incentives for perſeverance in the fruitleſſneſs of his labours, from continuing to plead the cauſe of the public. When the people abandon themſelves, it implies an imputation of knight-errantry to attempt to preſerve them. Who but La Mancha's Knight would undergo the toil and danger of forcing battlements, and burſting open priſons, when he knows that the captives within will hug their

their chains, and reject the liberty that is proffered them?

What inſults and indignities, what ſolemn mockery, and formal ſcorn have not the people of England ſubmiſſively born within theſe three laſt months? A recapitulation would be as irkſome and mortifying as it is unneceſſary. The marks of the ignominious ſtripes are yet raw upon our backs. They are kept open and bleeding by reiterated blows. Not a ſingle day paſſes without adding to their number and ignominy, yet the people ſlaviſhly acquieſce; they even court the hand that ſmites them.

The ſpirit of our anceſtors ſeemed indeed to rouſe itſelf for a time to a promiſing exertion. A ſudden ray of hope burſt upon us. We began to augur the happieſt conſequences from the tranſport with which all ranks of men ſeemed to hail its appearance. But it ſunk again as ſuddenly, and a train of evils ſucceeded, ſuch as it was natural to dread from an unſucceſsful attempt to reſiſt the encroachments of deſpotiſm. Our oppreſſors were but the more encouraged in their tyrannical ſyſtem of governing with a rod of iron; the friends of the people were diſcouraged, diſpirited, diſperſed; their enemies triumphed, they encreaſed in their numbers, they acquired a conſiſtency and permanency of power, which their moſt

ſanguine

ſanguine votaries could ſcarce have dared to anticipate by their warmeſt wiſhes.

Oppreſſed with theſe conſiderations, I had determined to relinquiſh the cauſe. I found, beſides, that a ſet of men had engaged in its defence, whoſe miſguided zeal and furious ſpirit blaſted every rational hope of ſucceſs. Intemperate zealots, hurried away by their fanatical attachment to abſtruſe dogmas, eſtabliſhed in the gloom and inexperience of idle ſpeculation—Men, who perhaps might have made excellent Miniſters under the ſolitary Kings whom they profeſs to *admire*, who perhaps would have figured as great ſtatefmen and profound politicians of the parliamentary oaks, which covered the tumultuary meetings of a barbarous people, collected from the thinly-ſcattered ſettlements among the wilds and deſarts of Britain.

Theſe violent partizans ſoon began to divert the attention of the people from the great ſubſtantial objects of reformation to ſubjects of curious diſquiſition, and ſpeculative politics, on which the beſt friends to the liberties of this country *were known* to be divided in opinion. The very inſtant they perceived the efficacy of a ſettled union of all parties againſt the corrupt ſyſtem of government, that inſtant they ſtarted a queſtion, which they muſt have foreſeen would

would prove fatal to that union, and deſtructive of all our hopes.

It was not poſſible that they could be ignorant of the unhappy conſequences.—They had only to look back to their own experience. They had played the ſame game on former occaſions, and the event was freſh in their minds. It was not, therefore, without a ſtrong colour of juſtice, that they were accuſed by many honeſt men of being actuated by the worſt motives, and that their conduct was ſuſpected to originate from ſome baneful and malignant cauſe, which it was not in the ſtores of general information to trace.

I by no means wiſh to diſcuſs this odious ſubject. One thing is evident. They and the Miniſter ſeemed to vie with each other, who ſhould moſt effectually deſtroy the foundation that had been laid for the redemption of this country. Their very language was the ſame. The moſt virulent and abuſive runners of government never poured forth a fouler torrent of invective againſt a ſet of men, whom they have cauſe to dread as their moſt dangerous and ſteady opponents, than thoſe gentlemen who profeſs themſelves to be equally the enemies of that government. Whoever preſumed to diſſent from their excluſive doctrines was anathematiſed with all the malice and virulence of

of *infallibility*. An agreement in eſſentials was no plea to their indulgence. It was nothing that we joined with them in admitting the *text*; there were ſome who preſumed to have an opinion of their own in the *interpretation*, and they were inſtantly ſecluded from the pale as damnable heretics, actuated by the worſt of motives, and deſerving of tortures, fire, and gibbets. The common enemy, in their eſtimation, was not half ſo dangerous. They were ſuffered to eſcape and to triumph, while all the efforts of thoſe furious ſectaries were turned againſt the party with which they had ſet out on a laſt vigorous attempt to reſcue the country from the hands that had brought it to ruin.

And what has been the reſult? Let them caſt their eyes back to the fatal point of ſeparation, and ſee whither the road they have been pleaſed excluſively to take, has led them. They have fallen into the very ſnare the Miniſtry had ſpread for them. They have divided, and loſt that ſtrength, which union alone could give them. They have diſguſted the moſt hearty friends of the cauſe they wiſh to maintain. As far as their teſtimony can operate, they have confirmed all the infamous imputations with which the creatures of the Court have laboured to brand the characters of men, who for ſeventeen years together have braved all the malice and calumny,

calumny, as well of miniſterialiſts as of *falſe brethren*, in defending their country to the beſt of their judgment; they have conſequently aſſiſted Miniſtry in deſtroying their reputation, and by holding them forth in the moſt odious and contemptible colours, have robbed them of that credit and confidence which it was neceſſary for the general good that the people ſhould place in their integrity. They have given the moderate *a reaſon*, and thoſe who ſcreen their ſlaviſh wiſhes under that character a *pretext* for relinquiſhing the defence of the people, and giving up the field entirely to the enemy. They have broken the ſpirits of the ſober and well meaning among all ranks; they have filled their minds with doubts, perplexities, and apprehenſions; they have forced them to deſpair of ever finding a determined and ſteady hand to reſcue the nation from the gulph of deſtruction into which our preſent rulers have plunged it.

Theſe are the mighty feats they have atchieved. I wiſh them much joy, and as far as they are concerned, will leave them to reap the happy fruits of their penetration and judgment. I will leave the *ſpeculators* to dream in their *great chairs*; I will leave the *admirers* of the infancy of our conſtitution to ſearch their muſty prints, and trace its unformed lineaments while it was yet in the grizle.

grizle. The doubts they are pleaſed to expreſs of the honeſty of my intentions, I ſhall freely forgive, in the hopes I entertain of the ſincerity of theirs, and ſhall at leaſt give one proof that I mean well to the cauſe, by avoiding their example, and not proſecuting a controverſy from which none but the Miniſtry can reap any advantage. Theſe gentlemen may continue to ſerve them as they have done; I aſſure them, that however I lament their folly, I ſhall have more charity in judging of their views and motives, than they have manifeſted in pronouncing ſentence upon thoſe who differ with them in opinion.

I have again taken up the pen to addreſs myſelf to men of a very different character, whom yet, I fear, their arts and repreſentations have miſled. I wiſh to call upon thoſe from whoſe name, rank, and abilities, the nation expects its deliverance, to try if this unhappy breach cannot yet be made up, and the attention of the people brought back to the original object of their petitions.

All the hopes of our enemies are placed in our diviſions. By theſe alone they triumphed in their laſt ſtruggle with the people. If once theſe can be reconciled they will tremble once more; nor can any thing avert the fate they have ſo long merited, but an obſtinacy in enforcing the ſubjects that have given riſe to our diſſenſions.

FROM THE PUBLICK ADVERTISER.

TO SIR JOHN DALRYMPLE.

[*This Letter was written by* William Burke, *Eſq. who was Under-Secretary of State to General* Conway.]

SIR, *March* 15, 1773.

A PERSON of your name, age, and ſtature was about ſeven years ago turned out of an office, which he held in the Exciſe in Scotland, for corruptly taking money in the execution of that office.

Pray, Sir John, was this you?

Becauſe if it was, your being ſo diſgracefully turned out by Lord Rockingham's adminiſtration, the only body of men that have hitherto not humbled themſelves before the King and his favourite, will eaſily account for the extraordinary pains which you both have taken to traduce the fair fame of the anceſtors of thoſe miniſters, and will relieve many perſons from the difficulty they now are under of being obliged to ſuppoſe this attempt to have no other foundation than that blackneſs of heart which dictated the book of Lauder againſt Milton, or that impotent

potent ſpirit of revenge, which, during the reign of James the Second, glutted itſelf in the richeſt blood in the country.

As I learn from Thurſday's Public Advertiſer that you can condeſcend to write letters in the News-papers, pray ſend me an anſwer to this query through Mr. Woodfall. If you are ſilent, I ſhall take for granted my information is true, and that you are that John Dalrymple, and I ſhall then ſoon trouble you with another letter upon this ſubject.

I am,

Your very humble ſervant,

DOUGLAS.

March 17.

ON the 15th inſtant there appeared a letter, which charges Sir John Dalrymple with having been diſmiſſed ſeven years ago, by Lord Rockingham's adminiſtration, from a law office in the exciſe of Scotland, on account of corruption in office, and with having invented his late hiſtorical diſcoveries againſt the anceſtors of his Lordſhip's party in revenge for it.

It is very true that Lord Rockingham's adminiſtration gave an office which Sir John (then Mr. Dalrymple) had, to another gentleman; but it is as true that Mr. Dalrymple, upon hearing that the change in the office had

had by ſome people been connected with his character, upon account of a complaint which two years before had been made againſt him by an Exciſe Officer, ſent a memorial to the Treaſury, in which he prayed juſtice to be done him in this laſt reſpect. The memorial was preſented to the late Lord Chancellor Yorke in perſon; and that Treaſury of Lord Rockingham, which had taken the office from Mr. Dalrymple, were ſo juſt to him as to make an order upon the memorial, which contained theſe words: "Acquit Mr. Dalrymple of "any charge of corruption in office, and "even of the ſuſpicion of it."

[*The truth of this pretended quotation is doubted. To have ſhewn the purity of Sir John Dalrymple's character, the writer ſhould have publiſhed the report made by the Officers of Exciſe in Scotland againſt him:—How long it lay ſecreted in the Treaſury by means of his friend Mr. T. Whately during Mr. Grenville's adminiſtration:—What applications were made to Lord Rockingham by Mr. Yorke, (who was known to have more influence over his Lordſhip than any other perſon,) to get him reſtored:—and the* WHOLE *of the minute of the Board of Treaſury upon it.*]

March

March 5, 1773.

[*This Paper was written by* John Wilkes, *Eſq.*]

IT is very curious to obſerve the ſingular pleaſure, with which the new publication of the ſecond volume of *Sir John Dalrymple's Memoirs* has been received by all the Scots among us, by the Engliſh Courtiers, and their maſter. They openly exult and aſſert, that all public virtue is an impoſture, and the very pretence to it ridiculous, ſince it is now proved, as they ſay, that *Lord Ruſſel intrigued with the Court of Verſailles, and Algernon Sidney took money from it.* The pretended diſcovery has afforded a *ſolid ſatisfaction* to the Royal mind, and Sir John Dalrymple's friend and patron, Lord Mansfield, for many months has made theſe ſubjects the favourite topicks of his converſation. He dwells with rapture on the diſcovery. The inference is clear, the application evident. Is any man held forth as a great model of public virtue and ſpirit? The courtiers' reply is prompt, *Lord Ruſſel intrigued with the Court of France.* Is a patriot applauded, who has dared and ſuffered every thing for his country? The placeman ſhrugs up his ſhoulders, and ſays, *Algernon Sydney took money from France*, and indirectly hints he believes the ſame of every other

other popular character. A treachery of ſo black a nature is moſt readily adopted by every man, who is conſcious that in ſimilar circumſtances he would have acted the ſame part. In all probability he has ſecretly wiſhed for the like offer. A Prince likewiſe, whoſe firſt aim is the deſtruction of a free conſtitution, believes himſelf, and carefully propagates, the doctrine, that all mankind are knaves, and may be eaſily made ſlaves. He finds ſomething in his own breaſt which ſuggeſts this to him, for the ſouls of tyrants and ſlaves are congenial. Almoſt half the volume of Dalrymple conſiſts of papers ſupplied by the preſent king. Kings too generally judge in the moſt ſuperficial manner, and merely from what falls under their own view. The Prince therefore, and the keeper of Newgate, think themſelves equally juſtified in declaring all men rogues. A *Bute* and a *North* are continually before the one, a *Macquirk* and a *Kennedy* before the other. But virtuous men unwillingly ſuſpect the wickedneſs of great characters, who have long enjoyed a nation's eſteem, and require the moſt ſatisfactory evidence of any degree of baſeneſs in thoſe, who have bravely died for their country, whoſe reputation has been ſealed with their blood, and conſiſtent and uniform in their laſt moments, have given the moſt trying proofs of a ſincere and noble patriotiſm.

patriotiſm. Let us now examine the proofs againſt the two martyrs of liberty. I find no kind of evidence in the whole volume but the deſpatches of *Barillon*, the French ambaſſador here, which Sir John Dalrymple ſays, are in the *Depôt des Affaires Etrangeres et Verſailles*, and of whoſe exiſtence we want better evidence than his aſſertion. He declares "from comparing the notes which I took in "France, with the copies of the papers ſent me "from thence, I find, in ſome inſtances, a "difference in the *dates* between us, owing, "probably, to my overſight; but in all other "reſpects, the copies agree with the notes." *Dates*, Sir, are as eaſily copied as words; and a man, who can miſtake, *in ſome inſtances*, in figures, is very likely to miſtake, in other inſtances, in letters and words. *Records* have, we know, been *altered*. Such a confeſſion of a want of accuracy muſt be fatal to any work, and the public will naturally expect a more faithful copier of public records than Lord Mansfield's friend, Sir John Dalrymple. Do you aſk other proofs, or wiſh to examine theſe pretended originals? Neither the immenſe collection of Engliſh records and memoirs at the Britiſh Muſeum, nor the numerous manuſcripts at either of our Univerſities, contain a ſingle line of ſuch an infamous ſuggeſtion againſt the ſacred memory of the two Engliſh heroes; but a Scottiſh

Scottiſh Baronet, under the patronage of a Scottiſh Lord, has given, as he ſays, an extract of a French diſpatch, which he aſſerts may be ſeen in the *Depôt des Affaires Etrangeres at Verſailles*, ſhould the Duke d'Aguillon permit you, as he did Sir John, with *liberality of ſentiment*, if you are diſpoſed to believe him. It is indeed extremely remarkable, that this ſame Duke d'Aguillon, who was guilty of all the unjuſt and inhuman proceedings againſt Monſieur de la Chalotais, who was the principal in the plot to fix the famous *forged letters* on that excellent French patriot, is now lending his aſſiſtance to Lord Mansfield and Sir John Dalrymple to ruin the well-earned reputation of two patriots of our nation, and to blaſt the glorious laurels, purchaſed with the beſt blood of our iſland. It ſeems a freſh conſpiracy of the French and Scots againſt us. The cauſe and the men are indeed well worthy of each other. But England looks down with contempt on theſe mean and baſe arts, and continues to revere the memory of her Ruſſel and Sydney:

> Dear as the ruddy drops that warm the heart,
> They dy'd amidſt their dying country's cries;

and are now in poſſeſſion of that ſupreme reward, a virtuous fame, which they enjoy unenvied by all the wiſe and good, reviled only by the courtier and the ſlave. Their

enemies now attempt in vain with ſacrilegious hands to overturn their temples, and deſtroy their altars, to give us idols of their own kirk, more ridiculous than ever Egypt worſhipped. But Ruſſel and Sydney will remain the great objects of a nation's veneration and love, while the names of Bute and Mansfield will ever be uttered with contempt and abhorrence.

What *Burnet* ſays of Sydney is equally applicable to Ruſſel, and may ſerve for a clue to the conduct of both. "He (Sydney) did all "he could to divert people from that war (with "France): ſo that ſome took him for a penſi- "oner of France: but to thoſe to whom he durſt "ſpeak freely, he ſaid, *he knew it was all a* "*juggle; that our Court was in an entire con-* "*fidence with France*, and had no other deſign "in this ſhew of a war, but to raiſe an army, "and keep it beyond ſea till it was trained and "modelled."—Biſhop Burnet's Hiſtory of his own Time, 8vo. edition, vol. 2, page 362.

Sir John Dalrymple in the preface ſays, "His Majeſty—juſtly conſidering hiſtory to "be the ſcience of Kings, and willing that "the actions of other Princes ſhould be tried "by that *tribunal of public enquiry*, which, "he truſts, will do honour to his own." Do you believe this, *Sir John?* I will confine myſelf to two particulars. The *tribunal of the public* has already judged the Sovereign for the horrid maſſacre in St.

George's Fields, on the ever memorable tenth of May 1768, the letter of thanks, &c. —The reſult need not be told—it is well known.—When the circumſtances of the death of the late Chancellor Yorke, and of the four preceding days, come to be fully known, (and they ſhall be told,) every ſoul will be chilled with horror; tears of virtuous pity ſhall flow for the deceaſed, and the baſe, hypocritical, and barbarous author of his unhappy fate be held in eternal execration.

JUSTICE.

March 26.

To the real EDITOR *of Sir* J. DALRYMPLE'S *Memoirs.*

SIR,

I SHALL not complain of the old law of the hiſtorian, *ne quid veri dicere non audeat*, but on the contrary would in plain Engliſh ſay to him, *You ſhall ſpeak the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, ſo help you God.* It is not my intention therefore to trouble you upon this occaſion with the common, obvious queſtion of the moraliſt, "What good do you propoſe by this publication? Is it to ſhew that there is no more virtue in one party than another, and that the *Whig* is not an honeſter man or better patriot

than the *Tory?* Or is it to teach the youth of the preſent reign this general leſſon, *liberty and the love of one's country are mere pretences at all times, and in all men?* Can any good conſequence flow from the eſtabliſhment of ſuch doctrine?" I will anſwer for you, *truth is truth, and a true picture of human nature can never be unuſeful.* But then, Sir, I hope you have publiſhed the whole truth, and concealed nothing out of favour or affection to any body. Excuſe the plainneſs of my phraſe, who am a mere country gentleman, and borrow the language of the bar to witneſſes on a trial. I am uſed to juries. My reaſon for the putting the queſtion is, that a friend of mine has in his laſt letter informed me from town, that a report is there circulated of your having ſuppreſſed ſome letters contained in the trunk at Kenſington. The ſtory is, that the ſuppreſſed letters are from the Princeſs Sophia to the abdicated and proſcribed James the Second, in the year 1689, and that they contain a correſpondence for the purpoſe of reſtoring him to the Engliſh throne. It is ſaid that you have publiſhed the letters in the before-mentioned Trunk, (with an excluſion of one other perhaps,) excepting theſe letters from the Court of Hanover; I therefore deſire to know the motive you had for this ſuppreſſion. It cannot be a tenderneſs for K. William, becauſe it is well underſtood that

he

he knew of this intrigue between the family of Brunſwick and Stuart, when he procured the ſettlement of the Crown of England upon the former; but that he overlooked it, becauſe upon the whole he was of opinion the ſettlement of the Crown there was the beſt that could be made for the ſecurity of the proteſtant religion, and of the liberties of this country, and of all Europe in general. He was not deceived in the principles of the Hanoverian Court, but acted upon larger and more generous motives. There would therefore be nothing ungrateful to the memory of this wiſe, diſintereſted *Dutchman* in ſuch publication. Why ſhould you then, a Revolutioniſt, ſeparate theſe letters from the reſt, and withhold them from the world? They are curious, and relate to a family that hath pleaded as much merit, religious and civil, as that of *Sydney* and *Ruſſel*, and to a family which hath reaped as much benefit from the Revolution as they did. An Engliſh Dukedom is not a greater reward to an Engliſh Earl, than the Britiſh Crown is to an Electoral Prince. Is it then more extraordinary or reproachful for private ſubjects, afraid for their liberty and religion, to unite with France, and to take French money, and uſe French power, in order to get rid of their tyrant and proſecutor, than for a Sovereign Proteſtant Prince, labouring under no difficulties,

culties, voluntarily to offer aſſiſtance to a Popiſh Tyrant to replace him on the throne of a free people, who had juſt expelled him, and thereby to deſtroy their liberties both civil and religious? *Sydney* and *Ruſſel* availed themſelves as politicians of foreign power and money for noble and laudable ends, which they ſaw then no other means of compaſſing. They did not intrigue for the ſake of ſubjecting this kingdom to France, nor enter into any engagements deſtructive to England. On the other hand, I doubt not, that the Court of Hanover, not foreſeeing their own acceſſion, in conſequence of the Revolution, to our mighty Throne, acted on ſome little political motive, or perhaps out of affection to their ſecond couſin James the Second, without regarding the religious or civil rights of mere Engliſh ſubjects. Now, Sir, as impartiality is impartiality, and equality is equality, I long to know why theſe curious letters, by way of political anecdote and authentic hiſtory, were withdrawn and not publiſhed? Is a regard to the memory of the Princeſs Sophia preferable to a regard to the characters of thoſe men who voted the Engliſh Crown to her; or would the law of gratitude be more broken by your publiſhing letters that might reflect upon ſuch an anceſtor than upon ſuch benefactors? If truth, pure truth, be the rule of your conduct, why have

have theſe letters alone been ſecreted and withdrawn? I put theſe queſtions for the ſake of clearing away unjuſt ſurmiſes, which I dare ſay your anſwer will do. Being here for the air, I know little of what the town ſays, but being a plain ſpeaker, I put a downright query, when one occurs to me.

I am, Sir, always the ſame man, and

Your humble ſervant,

Lyme, March 20. HOLLES.

May 1.

To Sir JOHN DALRYMPLE, Bart.

LIKE a hardy Knight of old, you ſeem to delight in deſperate atchievements. To tear the rooted laurel from thoſe tombs, on which the univerſal and ſtrong hand of the nation had planted it; was an enterprize of no common mark and magnitude. Whatever be its ſucceſs, the very attempt will place you ſecond, at leaſt, in the liſts of fame, to that intrepid Blood; who dared to wreſt the Crown of England from its ſtrong hold. The worthy Prince, whoſe diadem he thus invaded, was pleaſed to take the robber to his boſom; to penſion and protect him.

Perhaps,

Perhaps, Sir, you may meet with the ſame favour from a pious Prince; after having endeavoured to ſubvert the principles which ſupport his Throne.

Give me leave, Sir, to ſay, without being ſuſpected of flattery, that your aſſociates, in this enterprize, were choſen with ſingular ſagacity. Let us review them. They will not indeed furniſh quite ſuch variety of character, as the heroes aſſociated in aſſailing the walls of Troy. But it is more to your purpoſe that they ſhould be as uniform in character, and as unanimous in ſentiment, as the Kings of Brentford.

In your liſt we find a Scotch Chief Juſtice, whoſe long line of anceſtry was never ſtained with one conſtitutional principle, or ſentiment of liberty; and of whoſe notorious attachment to the Houſe of Stuart, he has *ſolemnly* avowed himſelf the zealous inheritor—an Engliſh Lord, who having been converted from that faith which ennobled his anceſtors, to the new court-creed, will lend himſelf to any work, that may beſt prove the ſincerity of his converſion—a French Ambaſſador, whoſe infamous profeſſion was to pander vice, and corrupt virtue—a French Duke, who has proved himſelf an implacable and unprincipled enemy to the very name of Patriot; and is execrated, even in his own country,

country, as the moſt devoted inſtrument of arbitrary power.

Such are the characters of your choſen auxiliaries in defaming the dead. I flatter myſelf, they will fully juſtify the approbation I have given your ſagacity in the choice.

In one thing, however, you are leſs fortunate than thoſe who arraigned the perſons of Ruſſel and of Sydney. The Crown cannot pack a jury to try this queſtion. Indeed I can conceive but one way of procuring a jury, before whom your accuſation would have any chance of ſucceeding. It ſhould be drawn from among the citizens of Edinburgh, (the moſt loyal place in Scotland,) who, before his preſent Majeſty's virtues had atoned for the former principles of his Houſe, and made him popular in North Britain, were accuſtomed to aſſail the loyal few, who aſſembled annually to drink his health, with curſes, ſtones and fire-brands.—A ſcene, which no doubt you, Sir John, have often dwelt upon with delight. Unhappily however for you, the opinion of thoſe honeſt Scots will not decide the preſent queſtion. The candid public muſt determine upon the truth of your accuſation. This they will do, by weighing all the facts and circumſtances on which it is founded. It cannot be expected that your opponents can inſpect the depôt from which you pretend to have drawn this evidence

evidence of Ruſſel and Sydney's treachery. No one will imagine, for inſtance, that an enquirer, whoſe profeſſed purpoſe was to vindicate the virtuous characters of the friends to liberty and the people, would have the cordial recommendation of Lord Rochford, or the polite aſſiſtance of the Duke D'Aguillon. While you therefore, Sir John, enjoy every advantage which royal and miniſterial favour can give you, we muſt be contented with reaſoning from the evidence of thoſe truths which are uncontroverted, and thoſe facts from the depôt with which you may have thought it ſafe to furniſh us.

But there is one truth which he who would judge candidly on this queſtion, ought ever to keep in mind: That Scotch politics, like the Romiſh religion, hold that the end will always juſtify the means. Suppoſe for example, Sir John, that you and they who employ you, ſhould think it a deſirable object to diſcredit and defame the very name of Patriot, though the blackeſt falſehoods and forgeries were neceſſary to the purpoſe, the infamy of the means would, in your minds, be atoned for by the innocence of the end. For the truth of this principle I may appeal to every North Britiſh boſom; for an illuſtration of it, Sir John, give me leave to refer to your own book. You there tell us, that the non-jurors in Scotland having entered into a conſpiracy againſt

againſt King William, to cover their deſigns took the oaths of allegiance; [Vol. 1. p. 420.] and the Scotch Peers, who were fawning at Whitehall, procured the Earl of Arran's enlargement, who had been committed on ſuſpicion, by aſſuring the King that he, together with them, would immediately ſwear allegiance to him. They accordingly retired to Scotland, took the oaths, and privately joined the conſpirators. You tell us, Sir, that ſome of them ſaid, "it was no ſhame to do a wrong thing in a right cauſe; and others, that they would play at the game of blindman's buff in Parliament, by which means William would not find out his friends from his foes."—[Ibid 421.]

The deepeſt and moſt deliberate treachery, with the moſt ſolemn appeal to God, was regarded by theſe honeſt Scotchmen, as a very ſport, or a covert and convenient ſeeming, under which they might, without imputation, effectuate their flagitious purpoſe. Such are the principles, and ſuch the practices of Scotchmen, which thoſe who are unhappily connected with them, will find to prevail not only in their political meaſures, but in every other tranſaction in life.

Your charge againſt Sydney, is founded on this article in Barillon's account of his diſburſements, *to Algernon Sydney* 500*l.*

If the fact of his having received this money

money were ever ſo undeniable, ſtill it would be but candid to judge, from his character and conduct, that he did it, not for his own emolument, but more effectually to ſupport an oppoſition to the arbitrary view of the Court. For it muſt be remembered, that we are ſpeaking of that character, which Milton has commemorated in theſe honourable terms: *Atque ſidmeum—quod ego illuſtre nomen, noſtris ſemper adheſiſſe partibus, gratulor.*

Shall ſuch a reputation be touched, by an unvouched extract, made by a ſingle and ſuſpected hand, from a depôt into which the originals might have been foiſted, and thoſe falſified a thouſand ways, containing a charge that ultimately reſts on the authority of a very infamous perſon, whoſe intereſt was concerned in making it? Shall the names of Ruſſel and of Sydney, which have been ſanctified by their ſufferings, in the moſt glorious of all human enterprizes, the redemption of public liberty, ſuſtain the ſmalleſt diminution of that high reverence we owe them, from an accuſation ſo weak and wicked?

And now, Sir John, I muſt take leave to tell you that there is not the leaſt colour for your charge—that it is moſt malicious in its aim, moſt ſuſpicious in its manner, and moſt impotent in its iſſue. Retire then and ſeek conſolation in the candid boſoms of that high

and

and choſen pair, who have actuated and aided your attempt. As they meant to participate in its ſucceſs, let them at leaſt ſhare the infamy and opprobrium that will inevitably attend it.

I have many pardons to aſk of the Engliſh nation, for reviving that national jealouſy; which however neceſſary, is always painful to generous minds. I am conſcious of having done it, not to gratify any little or malignant paſſion. Nor could I help endeavouring to vindicate, from the malice of men as high in place as they are baſe in principle, thoſe patriots, to whoſe noble efforts and illuſtrious ſufferings we owe that free conſtitution, which I hold the moſt ineſtimable of all earthly bleſſings, and for which I would willingly lay down my life.

HOLLES.

To the Printer of the Public Advertiſer.

Vitam impendere vero. ROUSSEAU.

SIR, *May* 27, 1773.

NO one who wiſhed well to ſociety would endeavour to repreſent the beſt of characters in the moſt odious lights, and in a long detail of men and manners, not let to public view

one great and worthy example.—Had the ſame diligence been exerted to trace out virtuous actions that has been uſed to imagine and rake up vice, the author of the Memoirs of Great Britain would have been eſteemed and enrolled among the illuſtrious writers who promote public virtue, inſtead of being deteſted and reproached for propagating falſehold and infamy. It has been proved that he is intereſted and partial; his authorities of no weight, reſting on a ſingle evidence, and the truth and honeſty of that evidence ſtrongly ſuſpected, and all againſt the general tenor, practice and principles of the men who maintained them with their blood. His relations and comments, compared with facts, prove his diſingenuity, and want of candour and truth. Sydney's return to England was not obtained by the court of France, but by Henry Saville, the Engliſh Embaſſador at Paris, as is evident by a letter from Sydney to him. [*Sydney's Letters*, 4*to*. *p*. 104.] Mr. Pelham, at the trial of Sir John Fenwick, aſſerts, that Mr. Algernon Sydney was a man who had that love for liberty and the good of his country, that he would not have ſaid, "that "the law of God and man require two "witneſſes to proceed againſt a man," even to ſave his own life, if he had thought it inconſiſtent with either of them.—[*Sydney's Trial*, 131.] Barillon ſays, the ſervices I draw

draw from Sydney do not appear, for his connections are with obſcure and concealed perſons.—[*Memoirs*, *vol.* 11. 287.]

In another letter, Mr. Sydney is one of thoſe who talks to me with the moſt force and the moſt openneſs on the article of maintaining the liberties of England and Holland ſeparate.—[*Ibid*, 313.]

It is a common and baſe practice to fix obnoxious names, and thereby ruin a character in the public eſteem, though with the diſcerning few, names prove nothing; the names of Heretick, Deiſt, and Self-murderer, with the generality of the world, are odious and reproachful.

The writer aſſerts, that Sydney, Eſſex, and Hampden were determined deiſts, and that they believed they had a right over their own lives.—[*Ibid*, *vol.* 1. 21.]

This aſſertion is void of all truth and juſtice; for how does he attempt to prove it? By the moſt diſingenuous and unnatural turn of a paſſage in a moſt excellent letter of Sydney's, to a friend who preſſed his return home.—Shall I renounce all my old principles, learn the vile Court arts, and make my peace by bribing ſome of them? Shall their corruption and vice be my ſafety? Oh! no—I hope I ſhall die in the ſame principles in which I have always lived, and will live no longer than they can preſerve me. I have in my

my life been guilty of many follies, but I hope of no meanneſs. I will not blot and defile that which is paſt, by endeavouring to provide for the future. I have ever had in my mind, that when God ſhould caſt me into ſuch a condition as that I cannot ſave my life but by doing an indecent thing, he ſhews me the time is come when I ſhould reſign it.—[*Sydney*, *p.* 16, 4*to.*] The plain and candid ſenſe is ſure no more than a firm reſolution to maintain his principles, and to ſubmit to the part allotted him by Providence. His being a deiſt is equally void of truth. Burnet ſays, he ſeemed to be a Chriſtian, but in a particular way of his own. He thought it to be a divine philoſophy in the mind.—[*Burnet*, 538.] At his condemnation he exclaimed with energy, O God! O God! ſanctify theſe ſufferings unto me, and impute not my blood to the country nor city through which I am to be drawn. Let no inquiſition be made for it; but if any, and the ſhedding of innocent blood muſt be revenged, let the weight of it fall upon thoſe that maliciouſly perſecute me for righteouſneſs ſake. In the paper at his execution he refuted the teſtimony of guilt, and prayed for his country. Lord forgive theſe practices (THE PACKING OF JURIES), and avert the evils that threaten the nation from them; and though I fall a ſacrifice to idols,

idols, ſuffer not idolatry to be eſtabliſhed in the land. Bleſs thy people, and ſave them; defend *thine own cauſe*, and defend thoſe that defend it; ſtir up ſuch as are faint; direct thoſe that are wavering. Grant that I may die glorifying thee; that at the laſt thou haſt permitted me to be ſingled out as a witneſs of thy truth, and even by the confeſſion of my opponents, for that good old cauſe in which I was from my youth engaged, and for which thou haſt often and wonderfully declared thyſelf.—[*Sydney*, 196, 4to.]

To the King inſtead of applying for mercy, he demanded only juſtice. He ſays, ſome through fear have deflected, from the integrity of their principles; but I think there are many who have kept their garments unſpotted, and I hope that God will deliver them and the nation for their ſakes. God will not ſuffer this land, where the goſpel of late has flouriſhed, more than in any part of the world, to become a ſlave of the world, but will ſtir up witneſſes of the truth, and in his own time ſpirit his people to ſtand up for *his cauſe*, and deliver them; and in his goodneſs he did deliver them at the moſt glorious and happy revolution.

I know my Redeemer lives, and as he has in a great meaſure upheld me in the day of my calamity, hope that he will uphold me by his ſpirit in this laſt moment, and

giving me grace to glorify him in my death, receive me into the glory prepared for thoſe that fear him when my body ſhall be diſſolved.—[*Apology*, 198.] Are theſe prayers agreeable to the principles of a deiſt which are dictated by the belief of a particular Providence and divine interpoſition?

Oh! ſhame to letters, ingenuity and truth!

I had rather my ſon had turned his back in the day of battle than have injured the characters of Sidney and Ruſſel.

As conſtitution might occaſion the one, the other has no excuſe but mere depravity of mind.

TIMOLEON.

LETTERS ON THE SALE OF PLACES.

July 16, 1769.

HAVING just now read a letter containing, by evident inſinuations, a moſt audacious attack upon my character, printed by you, in your paper of Friday laſt, aſſerting a groſs and infamous lie from beginning to end; I do hereby publicly call upon you to name the perſon from whom you received the account you have preſumed to publiſh. If you are either unable or unwilling to do this, I ſhall moſt certainly treat you as the author, and, in juſtice both

to

to myſelf and others, who are every day thus malignantly and wickedly vilified, I ſhall take the beſt advice in the law if an action will not lie for ſuch atrocious defamation, and if I may not hope to make an example of the author of it.

The ſcurrility in general which has been of late ſo heaped upon me in the public papers, I have hitherto treated with the contempt my friends and myſelf thought it deſerved, and ſuffered it to paſs with impunity; but this laſt is ſo outrageous, and tends ſo much to wound my character and honour in the tendereſt part, that I am determined, if practicable, to ſee if a jury will not do me and the public juſtice againſt ſuch a libeller, and whether they will not think the robbing an innocent man of his character is a robbery of the moſt dangerous kind, and that the perpetrators of it will ſtick at nothing.

For the preſent, I muſt content myſelf with only laying before the public the two following letters, which will explain to them all the knowledge I had of the deteſtable fraud, which has been taken advantage of to charge me with corruption; a crime, which, of all others, I hold the moſt in abhorrence. I defy the whole world to prove a ſingle word in your libellous letter to be true, or that the whole is not a barefaced, poſitive, and entire lie—That it is ſo,

I do aſſert, and I call upon any body, if they can, to diſprove what I ſay.

GEORGE ONSLOW.

COPY OF A LETTER TO MR. ONSLOW;

RECEIVED THE 27TH OF JUNE.

SIR, *New Bond-Street, June* 25, 1769.

I BEG you will pardon my thus addreſſing you, a liberty I could not think of, was any thing leſs than my family's bread at ſtake—Some weeks paſt my huſband paid a large ſum of money (which gave us inexpreſſible ſorrow to raiſe) to a party, who proteſt they are empowered by you to inſure him, in return, the collectorſhip of Piſcataway in New Hampſhire. I have been told this day one Hughes is in poſſeſſion of the ſame, and the treaſury books confirm the news. I beg leave moſt earneſtly to intreat you will inform me whether Mr. Hughes is under any engagement to reſign, or whether we are duped by thoſe who have taken our money.

Mr. Burns has had the ſtrongeſt recommendations from perſons of undoubted veracity, and I believe, on all accounts, will be found to be perfectly capable and worthy of the employment.

Once

Once more I intreat, good Sir, you will excuſe this trouble, which is cauſed by a heart almoſt broken with the fear and terror of a diſappointment.

With the profoundeſt Reſpect,
I am, Sir,
Your moſt obedient,
Humble Servant,
MARY BURNS.

MR. ONSLOW'S ANSWER.

MADAM, *Ember-Court, June* 27, 1769.

YOUR letter was brought down to me hither only to-day, or I ſhould have anſwered it ſooner. Without having the honour of being known to you or Mr. Burns, it gives me much concern that any body ſhould be impoſed upon as you have been, and as much indignation that my name ſhould be made ſo infamous a uſe of. I ſhould have been under an equal degree of ſurprize, had I not this morning had ſome intimation of the matter from Mr. Pownall and Mr. Bradſhaw, and made ſome enquiry into it of Mr. Watkins at Charing-Croſs, with a determination to ſift this ſhocking ſcene of villany to the bottom, and which I ſhall now be encouraged in by the hopes of getting you your money reſtored to you, as well as the

the earneſt deſire I have to bring the perpetrators of this roguery to the puniſhment and ſhame they deſerve.

For this purpoſe, might I beg the favour of Mr. Burns to meet me at my houſe in Curzon-ſtreet about ten o'clock on Friday morning, I will go with him to Mr. Pownall's, of which I have given him notice; and I wiſh Mr. Burns would bring with him Mr. Watkins, or any body elſe that can give light into this unhappy and wicked affair.

Till this morning I never in my life heard a ſingle word of either the office itſelf, nor of any of the parties concerned: you will judge then of my aſtoniſhment, and indeed horror, at hearing of it to-day from Mr. Bradſhaw.

I am, Madam, &c.

GEORGE ONSLOW.

Since the writing of the above letters, more of this fraud has been detected, and further enquiry is making, in order to bring the actors in it to juſtice. A woman of the name of Smith, who lives near Broad-ſtreet, is the perſon who appears to be principally concerned in the fraud, the money being, it ſeems, for her uſe.

HAVING obſerved, in a news-paper of the 28th of July laſt, that it is inſinuated, that I have been the detector of a ſuppoſed

crime, imputed to the Right Hon. George Onſlow, Eſq. I do think it an act of common juſtice to declare, in this public manner, that I am intirely ignorant of the ſaid ſuppoſed crime, and all circumſtances relative to it; except that I have heard the ſtory mentioned in common converſation, and conſtantly treated as a calumny propagated to injure Mr. Onſlow's reputation.

Hanover-ſquare,
Aug. 2, 1769. HILLSBOROUGH.

IT having been ſuggeſted, in a letter addreſſed to the Right Hon. George Onſlow, Eſq. publiſhed in a news-paper, dated the 28th of July laſt, that I was, together with Mr. Bradſhaw, ſent to Mr. Onſlow, on the ſubject of a ſcandalous tranſaction, in which Mr. Onſlow is, in the ſaid letter, ſtated to be concerned; it is become neceſſary for me, in juſtice to that gentleman, to declare that I never was ſent to Mr. Onſlow on that, or any other occaſion; but having heard this ſtory, I thought it but common juſtice to communicate it to Mr. Onſlow, which I did through the channel of Mr. Bradſhaw.

Whitehall, Aug. 2, 1769. J. POWNALL.

[BY MESSIEURS BURKES.]

Tueſday, Sept. 6, 1776.

LORD Mansfield has been lately left alone in the Houſe of Lords. "All the obliged have deſerted, and all the vain." He, who but a few days before, and with ſuch decided authority, had paſſed a bloody ſentence upon whole nations, has not been able to regulate the trial of one old woman.—[Alludes to the remarkable controverſy between Lord Mansfield and Lord Lyttelton, on the mode of trying the Ducheſs of Kingſton; the Houſe adopted Lord Lyttelton's plan in preference to Lord Mansfield's.]—His judicial conflict was with a boy; and he was baffled. Theſe indications of ſome odd change, though they appear in ſlight matters, are warnings which a wiſe man will not diſdain to take. They ought, in ſome meaſure, to abate the pride of power, and the confidence in favour. They ought to ſupple the heart, and to make it ſuſceptible of the ſoft contagion of our nature. They ought to diſpoſe it towards a favourable hearing of millions of people, lately flouriſhing, opulent, peaceful and happy, but now doomed to be the haraſſed and perſecuted objects of eternal piracy, rapine, and devaſtation.

If Lord Mansfield ſhould be found thus ſoftened towards an unfortunate, rejected branch of the Engliſh race, perhaps in ſome moments of humiliation ſo favourable to clemency, he might turn his eyes on the Engliſh ſtock itſelf. He might begin to ſuſpect, that the ſufferings of war cannot be confined to one ſide only; and that our own ſhare of theſe calamities may be worthy of ſome conſideration. He might feel the glory of burning the petty fiſhing town, Falmouth in New England, balanced by the taking of *St. John's*; he might think the ſtealing by Lord *Dunmore*, of a dozen or two of little, honey-combed, iron ſhip guns from a deſerted wharf in *Virginia*, of not quite ſo much importance as the loſs of *Canada*. Though it is undoubtedly ſome comfort to inſult the few Provincial Officers we take, by throwing them with common men into a gaol; and ſome triumph to hold the bold adventurer, Ethan Allen, in irons in a dungeon, in Cornwall; yet it may be thought not quite ſo pleaſant on the other hand, to have the corps of Engliſh Fuzileers priſoners of war by capitulation, in Connecticut, though under the tendereſt treatment from a mild, humane, and generous conqueror. The famine of Boſton, (which will vie in hiſtory with that of Peruſia, *Peruſina fames*,) the waſte of camp diſtempers, the ſlaughter at Bunker's-Hill, the

the diſperſion of tranſports, the ocean covered with wrecks, our Hanoverian allies periſhing on the coaſt of France, before the eyes of thoſe whom they had lately helped to defeat; the miſerable ruin of the finances of this kingdom, and that back-ſliding, which after twelve years' peace, has let us down into that condition of debt, in which we were left at the end of a war with half Europe.—All theſe conſiderations may, at a calm hour, riſe in an awful ſeries before Lord Mansfield; and, forcing one natural ſigh for the diſtreſſes of humanity, may diſpoſe him to liſten to an humble plea for peace. They may, perhaps, incline his ear to ſober enquiry, whether even an imperfect authority is not more eligible than a compleat war? and whether, all things conſidered, the ſpoils of America will be, in reality, ſo much a better thing than its commerce?

Lord Mansfield's argument againſt the *preſent* Colonies, from the votes of *one* of them in time *paſt*, was examined in my laſt letter.

I ſhall now take this buſineſs in another point of view. For a while I will go along with his Lordſhip. He ſhall have granted to him not only all, but much more than he aſſumes. I will allow that the Journals, not of *one*, but of *all* the aſſemblies, are full of factious reſolutions. Having for argument admitted

admitted this, I muſt beg leave to accompany my conceſſion with a matter of *fact*; which, though it will not at all excuſe ſuch contumacy in the Americans, it may abate ſome degree of that aſtoniſhment and indignation, which it ſeems to excite in a veteran politician, who has breathed the air of ſeventy winters in our climate, of clear and unclouded virtue.

The Twelve United Colonies have twelve popular aſſemblies. The number of Members they contain may be as large, within a trifle, as the Parliament of Great Britain. They are probably about five hundred perſons. Will his Lordſhip aſk, what *douceurs* are diſtributed among the whole body of theſe Repreſentatives; I do aſſure him, on the ſtricteſt enquiry, I do not find that the *twelve* American Parliaments, and the whole *five hundred* men who compoſe them, receive among them all one *fifth* part of the value of what is held by *one* ſingle gentleman, whom I could name, in the Houſe of Commons.

It is not that the ſoil of the plantations does not yield the conſtitutional ſtaple of lucrative employments. But theſe employments are almoſt all, with much more propriety, beſtowed in aid of a contracted Engliſh civil liſt, and as a ſupport and ſecurity to the independence of a Britiſh Parliament. They are certainly better beſtowed; for I have conſtantly obſerved, that all thoſe gentlemen who

who hold American employments, have been the moſt zealous of all others againſt the inſolent claims of the Coloniſts, and the moſt determined reſiſters of that factious and intereſted ſpirit, which dares unnaturally to inſult ſo gracious and beneficent a government.

If we did not know to a certainty, that not a ſhilling is ſpent in England upon elections; and that the emoluments, ſo liberally diſtributed in Parliament, have no ſhare in producing any part of that complaiſance to government, which diſtinguiſhes our age, and puts to ſhame the ſtubborn ſpirit of our anceſtors, we might, inſtead of being aſtoniſhed at ſuch inſtances of oppoſition, be rather ſurpriſed, how it has happened, that in popular aſſemblies ſo little managed, the oppoſition to government has not been greater, more frequent, more fierce, and more extenſive. So much rich compoſt is laid upon the highly dreſſed, and productive ſoil of a Britiſh Parliament, and ſuch attention is beſtowed on its thorough cultivation, that theſe remote parts have been neglected, and ſuffered to ſhoot out all the wild weeds of a vigorous, but uncultivated nature. Except inſulting reproaches, angry prorogations, ſudden diſſolutions, rejected petitions, with now and then a challenge to diſpute on the origin of government, (Vide Governor Hutchinſon's famous ſpeech,) I can find nothing that has been

been practiſed to "tame the genius of the ſtubborn plain," or to mollify the hereditary ſpirit of independency, that is charged upon the American Aſſemblies. Under ſuch indolent neglect, and ſuch churliſh attentions, I could not poſitively anſwer for the mellowneſs and tractability even of a civilized Britiſh Parliament. I ſhould not however conclude, from ſome ſour humours in our Houſes of Parliament, that a barren *independence* was the object of their wiſhes; but that, like peeviſh virgins, they longed for ſomething elſe.

Oppoſition to the authority of acts of Parliament is not a thing new in the dependencies of this empire, nor confined to America. A denial of that authority in much greater extent, had once been very popular in Ireland. *Molineux*, one of their moſt celebrated authors, (a great natural philoſopher like Doctor Franklin,) a friend and a correſpondent of Locke, wrote a book which is ſtill in requeſt. The object of this book is to prove, that England had no power to make *any laws whatever* to bind Ireland. The aſſertion is not limited to taxes; it is as broad and general as legiſlature itſelf on the largeſt plan. That book indeed was burnt by the hands of the common hangman *here*; but the doctrines gained ſo much ground *there*, that the Judges who admitted appeals to England were perſecuted by the Iriſh Houſes

of

of Lords and Commons with the greateſt rigour and aſperity, and obliged to fly in a body to England.

In conſequence of this a declaratory act was paſſed, aſſerting the ſupreme legiſlative authority of Great Britain. Nothing further was done. No troops were ſent, or employed to enforce obedience. Time was given for the public ferment to ſubſide. The appeal to the Houſe of Lords in England, was left to find its own way by its own utility; and utility effected that which force could not have effected. The Iriſh ſuitors found an advantage in a judicature removed from local affections and local prejudices. At the ſame time the Iriſh Parliament was *ſoothed*, inſtead of being *bullied*. The leading intereſts were gained. The ſtubborn were ſoftened, and the angry pacified. By degrees, as it was natural, the ſtorm was blown over. The Iriſh Parliament kept its reſolutions. England received its appeals. No harſh laws were paſſed for the purpoſe of a *teſt*. No *tax* was impoſed for a *trial* of obedience. The queſtion of the right remains to this day open for the declamation of any gentleman in the Iriſh or Engliſh Parliament, and is frequently uſed with great innocence, as the intereſt or whim of the orator on either ſide directs him.

In Ireland it was not only in votes and reſolutions of Parliament, that the authority of

of Great Britain has met with oppoſition. The reſiſtance to the trade laws by tumultuous violence, has been frequent and often ſucceſsful. Wool was and is carried off in great quantities; and great mobs have frequently deſtroyed imported goods in one of the principal cities of that kingdom; while other mobs intimidated officers from preventing an export of prohibited manufactures in the other. It is not long ſince the exportation of live cattle to England was prevented by violence; a violence at which the Magiſtrates of Ireland thought proper to wink. Parliament thought proper to wink in its turn, at that violence and that neglect.

But if Parliament, on hearing of theſe diſorders, had directed the offending Iriſh ports to be blocked up, until the King ſhould think proper to open them: If, on the neglect of Magiſtrates (full as chargeable on Ireland as America) an Act of Parliament had violently ſubverted the corporate rights of their cities: If, on the votes of the Iriſh Parliament, derogatory to the authority of the ſupreme legiſlature, they had violently changed the conſtitution of the ſecondary Parliament: If they had refuſed all peace to Ireland, until the baniſhed Judges had reaſſumed their function, and until full compenſation was made to them for their loſſes,—there is no doubt that war alone would have

ſettled

ſettled our controverſy with Ireland, as it muſt, if we perſevere in the preſent meaſure, ſettle our controverſy with America.

To this hour the degree of ſubordination which Ireland owns, is altogether unaſcertained. Miniſters complain that America, in denying our right to tax, has not ſtated clearly the ſubmiſſion which ſhe admits to be due to the authority of Parliament. But has Ireland ever recognized half ſo much as America does in her letter to the people of England? Is it true, that in the mean time ſhe is quiet, dutiful, and obedient; and ſhe is ſo, becauſe this recognition never was required? Her late moſt extraordinary complaiſance to the Clerk of the Pells, and to the Vice Treaſurers, thoſe *profitable* ſervants of the public, ſhews that, in ſpite of her Journals, and the petulance of her progenitors, ſhe can prove as ſubſervient as can be wiſhed to the convenience of adminiſtration.

[Charles Jenkinſon, Eſq. Henry Flood, Eſq. Lord Clare, and Welbore Ellis, Eſq. by a late vote of the Iriſh Parliament, have 3500l. a-year each, over and above their expences. The firſt for life.]

Ireland gives largely to all public ſervices; and what is infinitely more important, to all private jobbs.—Why? Becauſe it is ſhe that *gives*, and not we that *take*.

Adminiſtration has lately furniſhed a ſignal proof

proof of their own opinion of the wiſdom of enforcing all the rights of the ſupreme legiſlature. It was but the other day (the beginning of this ſeſſion) that government applied to the Iriſh Parliament for liberal grants, in order to ſupply very large deficiencies. One would ſuppoſe, from the doctrines of Lord Mansfield and his colleagues, concerning America, that the Miniſter in the Iriſh Houſe of Commons, in order to ſucceed, muſt have opened his Budget by an high aſſertion of the rights of the Engliſh Parliament to tax Ireland; and that he had concluded by deſiring them, on the plan of Lord North's *conciliatory* motion, to furniſh ſuch a contingent to the ſupport of empire as Parliament here ſhould think proper. The proceeding of that ſucceſsful Miniſter was the direct reverſe. Inſtead of getting the Iriſh Houſe of Commons to acknowledge this right, he *himſelf* in effect diſclaimed it. He even denied, that the Engliſh Miniſtry ever had aſſerted it; and he deſcribed the ſpeeches on that ſubject in the Engliſh Houſe of Commons (though made by men in the greateſt offices) "as nothing more "than the raſh language of inconſiderate "individuals." (Mr. Rigby and Mr. Charles Jenkinſon.) Having very wiſely diſclaimed authority, the Iriſh Miniſter ſucceeded by intreaty. If he had held the language there, which Engliſh Miniſters

held to the Engliſh Colonies, the Parliament of that kingdom would hardly have been perſuaded to lend their troops in order to ſubdue Ireland in America. The only dependent part of the empire which is at peace, is at peace by Miniſtry's *diſclaiming*, not by *enforcing* our right.—The only revenue which is obtained, is obtained where the power of impoſing is renounced. So different, ſo very different, is unſubſtantial theory from ſound practice!

I flatter myſelf I have ſhewn, that the oppoſition to the extent of parliamentary powers has not been confined to America. I have ſhewn, that the denial in Ireland was of a *larger* extent than that in America; and therefore a denial of a *leſs* extent (confined to the right to tax) could be no proof of a formed deſign of independency, on the part of the Colonies, if denial in a *larger* extent cannot convict Ireland of the ſame offence. I have ſhewn that the Parliament of Ireland never made any formal acknowledgment of the power of this legiſlature to bind that kingdom; that the power of England there aroſe from our not puſhing every point; and that the aſtoniſhing obſequiouſneſs of Ireland at this hour, is owing to our not having made uſe of any one of thoſe methods of aſſerting authority, which have been recommended and uſed in America.

America. All this forms at leaſt a preſumption againſt the utility of ſuch methods.

I hope indulgence a little longer in this humble plea to Lord Mansfield, on the trial of America, for *miſpriſion of independence*. If in the end (what I will not imagine) the Judge ſhould give a harſh charge, the Jury of the public may poſſibly prove as refractory to the authority of Lord Mansfield, as the Houſe of Peers has been on a late occaſion; and though he directs them to convict, they may ſtill with ſome remains of Engliſh firmneſs, bring in the priſoner Not Guilty.

VALENS.

(BY THE SAME.)

Thurſday, Nov. 2, 1776.

IT ſeems to be in the natural courſe of things, that men are very rarely brought to a ſenſe of guilt or folly, but through the medium of ſuffering. We are obliged to the Miniſtry for having placed us in this ſchool of wholeſome diſcipline.

The miſconduct of the preſent war will by degrees lead the nation into a diſpoſition to enquire into the juſtice of it. Never was a war more open to an impartial examination of its merits. No Glare of falſe glory in the execution of our American meaſures, has hidden the defects, or gilded over the errors

of the original plan. We have only to pray, that our inſtruction may not come too late for our amendment.

I cannot eaſily quit the opinion, that however bitterly we may quarrel, there is ſtill ſuch a bottom of good nature, generoſity, and good ſenſe, both in the European and American part of the Engliſh nation, as will at length incline the one to hold out unequivocal, ſolid, *honeſt* terms of accommodation, and induce the other to meet thoſe terms (though late and ungracious in the offer) with a cordial and dutiful acquieſcence.

"The Americans are at war," (ſays Lord Mansfield, the great aſſertor of the plan of hoſtility) "they are acting on the *offenſive*— "whether we were *right or wrong*, we muſt "proceed—we muſt add violence to violence, "rigour to rigour—we are not to diſcriminate "the innocent from the guilty—if we do not "kill them, they will kill us."

It is really ſingular that a man in the cool decline of life, bred through the whole courſe of it in a profeſſion of peace, a Civil Magiſtrate, a Judge, covered to the chin with judicial purple, and bloodleſs unſpotted ermins, ſhould be diſtinguiſhed above all others, for a character of hazard and deſperateneſs in his counſels. Lord Mansfield's politics always ſtand upon a precipice. When he acted with others, in adviſing the late coercive

coercive meaſures, he alone was under no deluſion. His eyes were broad open to the conſequences. Knowing that thoſe meaſures led inevitably to Civil War, he uſed the fatal expreſſion and auſpice of Cæſar, when he ſtood on the execrated brink of that ſtream, the croſſing of which brought ruin on his country. He told the Houſe of Lords in plain words, that "they had now paſſed the "*Rubicon*." This Year he exhorts them to puſh on that Civil War, in a manner ſcarcely different from the precedent of Cæſar's ſpeech before the battle of Pharſalia. But we are not yet hardened by this inflammatory eloquence into ſuch black and decided enmity, as to unfit us for a temperate examination of his cauſe and arguments. "Kill them, or "they will kill us!"—Alas! my good Lord, Engliſhmen cannot chearfully accept this alternative, which you are ſo good to offer, until we are thoroughly convinced, that to kill them is not mortally to wound ourſelves.

This military adage, "Kill them, or they "will kill us," is as proper in the field of battle, as it is miſplaced and dangerous in council. When men have the bayonet to each other's breaſt, there is no time for reaſoning. But men deliberating at their eaſe, are not in that deſperate ſituation. It is not therefore neceſſary that they ſhould be animated with theſe deſperate ſentiments.

The

The buſineſs of the Stateſman, and that of the General, ought never to be confounded. It is the Province of the latter to conſider only how War is to be *made*. It is the duty of the former ſometimes to conſider how war is to be *ended*. Reconciliation, treaty, negociation, and conceſſion enter into the plan of the Stateſman, though not in the operations of the General. If Lord Mansfield's ſentiments ſhould prevail as maxims of policy, it would follow, that when men, upon whatever grounds, are driven to draw their ſwords, there muſt be no peace until one party or the other is exterminated.

That learned Lord reſts much on the *offenſive war* undertaken by the Americans, in (what is called) the Invaſion of Canada. This he adduces as a proof of their deſign of independency. If war had been as much Lord Mansfield's ſtudy, as it ſeems to be his inclination, he muſt have perceived, that it never was, nor ever could be confined to ſtrict defence. The very idea is full of abſurdity. When war is once begun, the manner of conducting it, will be ſuch as bids the faireſt for ſucceſs. It concludes nothing concerning the original motive for hoſtility, nor concerning the propriety or impropriety of making peace.

Theſe Things ſtand upon grounds totally different; the deſire of independency, like every

every other motive to war, muſt be judged of by the proceedings to that event.

For inſtance, I can conceive a caſe in which *Scotland* might take up arms: Scotland might defend the terms of the treaty of Union, even againſt the unlimitable authority of Parliament, which that treaty, by "a pre-"poſterous parade of civil arrangements," certainly does *affect* to limit. I can conceive in argument, that acts of parliament might paſs to exclude the ſixteen Peers of Scotland from their ſeats in the Houſe of Lords—or to alter the preſent happy eſtabliſhment of the Church of Scotland—or to change her laws for thoſe of England—or on the plea of her increaſe of trade and wealth, to raiſe the proportion of their land-tax. I can conceive too the *poſſibility*, that many Murrays, many Humes, many Campbells, many Stuarts, many Wedderburnes, many Dundaſſes, and many Elliotts, might take up arms in favour of thoſe limitations of the power of Parliament, which the act of Union *affects* to eſtabliſh; and not contenting themſelves with defending *Sterling*, and blocking up *Edinburgh*, they might enter *England*, and lay ſiege to *Berwick*, or penetrate to *Newcaſtle*. But I ſhould not therefore infer, that our Northern Kinſmen, who thus took up arms, were aiming at an *independency*, which would deprive ſo many of them of the well-earned emoluments,

emoluments, which are the conſequence of their connection with England.

If ſuch a caſe were to happen, I venture to aſſure Lord Mansfield, that I, and many Engliſhmen of far other conſequence, would hear him plead in favour of peace, and for *thoſe* rebels in 1776, with as much approbation, as we felt when he pleaded for juſtice againſt *other* rebels in 1746. If any Lord, heated with faction, or intoxicated with Court favour, ſhould then tell him in debate, that Engliſhmen were not to look at the juſtice of the cauſe—that we muſt not diſtinguiſh the innocent from the guilty—that his countrymen had acted on the offenſive—that if we did not kill them, they would kill us!—we might pardon ſuch a Lord his prejudice, from our indulgence to his zeal; but we could never be brought to approve of his temper, or to adopt his opinions.

If another Lord, at the expence of his candour and judgment, ſhould chuſe to diſplay his knowledge in hiſtory, and recapitulate all the ravages of the Scotch from the earlieſt times; their natural adherence to our natural enemy, France; their fierce ſtruggles for independency, notwithſtanding the well-proved rights of our ancient Kings—If a third (for ſuch a load of calumny would be too great for the ſhoulders of any two ordinary orators) ſhould carry down the ſtory

to the preſent day; if he ſhould ſtate the deſign of a ſeparate ſettlement of their crown in favour of the Pretender, from which their Chiefs were brought off with ſo much difficulty, and at ſo great an expence; if this odious remembrancer ſhould then revive the memory of the two rebellions ſince the act of Union, for the purpoſe of deſtroying that union, all this might ſound plauſible to ſome prejudiced ears; but I think in well-diſpoſed minds, it would excite the ſtrongeſt indignation. I ſhould rejoice to hear the thunder of that eloquence which Lord Mansfield would certainly hurl at the unfeeling ſophiſtry of this unjuſt, invidious, and plauſible kind of argument againſt peace. He would have the hearts and applauſes of all true Engliſhmen. True Engliſhmen would not fear that Scotland would be made ungovernable by our lenity; they would readily truſt to the fraternal affection of our Scotch brethren for a reſtoration of laſting peace; and with it, the rich Commerce of that country, and the ſervice and ſociety of thoſe few of its natives, who might not think fit to repaſs the Tweed, to enjoy at home the ſweets of that liberty which their valour had purchaſed for their country.

In this manner I ſhould reaſon on a Scotch rebellion growing from ſuch a principle. I mean a rebellion for preſerving themſelves in

in a ſtate of freedom; not a rebellion for the purpoſe of reducing themſelves and us to a common ſlavery. I cannot avoid applying the ſame reaſonings to America. I would endeavour to make peace with both on the *avowed* ground of the war; and I perſuade myſelf, that whatever the language of a few North-Britons about the Court, or expecting to get about the Court, may be, the body of the Scotch nation think and argue as I do.

I have no right to endeavour at diſcovering by divination the ſecret motives of any man's conduct; whilſt the oſtenſible are ſuch as may fairly influence an honeſt and a reaſonable man. To ſupport in argument, that independency was the original object of American reſiſtance, we muſt aſſume, or prove, that they had no colourable complaint or grievance. Lord Mansfield has too much honour and good ſenſe to aſſert, that there was nothing colourable or plauſible in their objection to their being taxed, in their circumſtances and ſituation, without their conſent. The practice on our ſide may, for aught I know, be reconciled to principles of ſtrict formal *law*; but we all know it can never be reconciled to any principles of *liberty*. The queſtion is then, whether an attempt to govern them contrary to the principles of liberty, could be a real cauſe

of quarrel, or was ſo idle and frivolous, as to oblige us to ſearch for ſome other ground of their conduct.

Whatever the firſt cauſe was, or whatever diſorders aroſe from it, the Americans did not go to extremities upon *that*. It is ſome proof of their not having premeditated a ſcheme of independency, that they waited for ſeveral other grievances before they took up arms.

Boſton loſt its port, and the Colony of Maſſachuſett's Bay forfeited its charter—juſtly ſays Lord Mansfield, but certainly without charge, evidence or hearing. Men conſider the right of being heard, as of ſome import in juſtice; if it be not, Lord Mansfield's office muſt become a ſinecure. Among other human frailties, men have a natural love for their local conſtitutions and particular privileges. We muſt allow that (however merited) the loſs of a favourite form of Government will be conſidered and felt as a very great hardſhip. Nations have thought an arbitrary and compulſory change, even of habits, to be grievous. A form of government changed, is a matter of ſomewhat more conſequence than the compulſory deprivation of a flapped hat at Madrid, or being ſtripped of the plaid, and forced into breeches in the Highlands.—[The reader need ſcarce be told, that in the year 1766 the

the attempt to oblige the Spaniards by force to leave off a ſlouched hat that was in uſe among them, created ſuch a diſturbance among the people of Madrid, as obliged the King to fly from his capital, and made it neceſſary for him to ſend his favourite out of the kingdom, who has never returned ſince. Much leſs do we ſuppoſe it neceſſary to inform the reader, that the permiſſion of quitting his breeches, and reſuming his plaid, is at this moment held out as a bribe to allure the Highlanders into the new levies againſt America.]

The bringing the perſons of the Americans to trial in England, by a revival and extenſion of a ſtatute of Henry the VIIIth; and the ſending them by an original act of George the IIId. to England, to look for juſtice on any ſoldier or Cuſtom-Houſe Officer who ſhould commit murder on their relation,—theſe have alſo ſomething of the air of a grievance. I ſhall ſay nothing of the Act for preventing their fiſhery, or of that for prohibiting all intercourſe between Colony and Colony,—all theſe have ſurely ſo much the air of hardſhips (I mean to thoſe who ſuffer under them) that I ſhould be much leſs ſurpriſed to find a people at length provoked to independency by ſuch acts, than I am to hear them accuſed of originally ſcheming that independency be-

cauſe

cauſe they reſiſted them. Men are not always ready to humble themſelves even before their Creator, and to acknowledge his puniſhments for tokens of loving-kindneſs. With men they are more inclined to diſpute; and the arguments which perfectly ſatisfy thoſe who are in haſte to inflict puniſhment, are not quite ſo convincing to thoſe who are to ſuffer it.

All thoſe laws (which look ſevere even in cold reading) preceded the commencement of hoſtilities, offenſive or defenſive. It is not true, that a deſire of free ſubjection is in nature the ſame thing with a ſcheme of independence; and we may ſuppoſe men earneſt to preſerve privileges, without rejecting government.

The Colonies, like others who have engaged in wars with their Sovereign, had therefore their grievance. But there the likeneſs ſtops; for there are perhaps no inſtances on record of a people in ſuch a ſituation, who have perſevered with ſuch a pertinacious humility, in repeating their ſupplications for redreſs. There are few or no inſtances of men in arms againſt the ordinary authority, who have ſo long confined their applications ſolely to their own ſovereign. Scarce any, where they have religiouſly avoided all caballing and tampering with foreign Powers. None where they have ſo nobly paid their debts

debts to the commerce of that power, with which they were at war. Whatever power we have of ſubſiſting without them, or of acting againſt them, is owing in a great meaſure to their deſire of avoiding a final rupture with us. Men aiming at independency could never have acted in this manner.

Why, in common ſenſe, ſhould we be more irritated againſt the Coloniſt than againſt other nations? or why ſhould we uſe other rules to prevent pacification, than we uſe towards a foreign power? I ſhould be glad to know whether this mode of reaſoning concerning old delinquency, or modern ill deſign, was adopted at the late treaty of Paris? Did the late Duke of Bedford's inſtructions oblige him to a diſcuſſion of the motives of France and Spain for half a century back? I don't find that our Court has received any ſatisfaction on that head. If the zeal and induſtry of Sir John Dalrymple, or Mr. Macpherſon have made any diſcovery in this curious mode of negociation, they will favour the world with a new quarto volume for the information of future ſtateſmen. In the mean time, I muſt think, that I do juſtice to the late Duke of Bedford (a man of ſenſe, and a good practical man of buſineſs) in ſuppoſing that he troubled himſelf with no idle enquiries that could obſtruct the work of pacification. I do not

hear

hear that Lord Mansfield has ever accuſed that Duke of a neglect of duty.

But we muſt not treat with Rebels! What hiſtory is it that ſupplies us with this maxim? Lord Mansfield will allow, that the war againſt Charles the Firſt was a rebellion; Lord Clarendon, I believe, ſtiles it by pre-eminence the *great rebellion*,—— does the hiſtory of that time ſupply us with no treaty between Charles the Firſt and the people in arms againſt him? Go to earlier times. How was the conteſt between Stephen and Henry? Stephen was conſidered as an uſurper, and perhaps he was ſo. He treated Henry's partizans as rebels; but theſe harſh names of Rebel and Uſurper never prevented negociation. Treaty and battle went on, as it were, hand in hand; and at laſt the conteſt ended in a compromiſe.

The ſhort and violent rebellion of Wat Tyler, ſhort as it was, yet afforded time for treating, and that too by the King in perſon. Does the Scotch hiſtory ſupply no inſtances of treaties between the rebellious Lords and their Kings? All hiſtories are full of them. Government often finds it ſafer to treat with her ſubjects, and to yield too, than to riſk the uncertain event of arms.

But in all wars foreign or civil, in all diſputes public or private, it is utterly impoſſible

poſſible to terminate a controverſy while one of the litigant parties chuſes to aſſume a ſort of ſupernatural talent of diſcovering the motives of men's actions; and loftily tells his adverſary, "I don't value your "offers and profeſſions. I know you mean "what you don't ſay; and I will not treat "with you on the avowed and apparent "cauſe of the quarrel, until my curioſity is "ſatisfied upon the ground of a ſuſpicion "which I am reſolved to entertain." I am perſuaded that this learned Lord would not argue ſo inconcluſively, or waſte his breath upon a point not in iſſue, if the real object of Miniſtry was to terminate the diſpute. What his Lordſhip's object is, I who take the liberty of complaining of his faculty of divination, and who am, by no means, provided with the endleſs line of his ſagacity in fathoming the motives of men, do not at all know,—and certainly dare not gueſs. But the effect of the conduct of his friends in pertinaciouſly continuing and weakly conducting a war without an object, will inevitably operate to the diſmemberment of the Britiſh Empire.

VALENS.

EXTRACT

Extract from a Letter to the Secretaries of State, on the SEIZURE OF PAPERS. *Dated May* 19, 1763.

I SHALL take the liberty of offering my thoughts upon that great article of SEIZING PAPERS, which, I own, ſtrikes me in a very ſtrong light.

Bail will deliver every man from impriſonment before conviction, for any offence, not capital. An illegal commitment may be corrected by the ſummary interpoſition of the king's courts; and even perſonal reſtraint, at the worſt, can only to any great degree affect the ſingle perſon who ſuffers it. I have not yet heard of a *Habeas Corpus* to redeem papers from captivity. Commiſſions of gaol delivery do not extend to them, nor can they petition for trial, in order to force their liberty. It is not *He only* whoſe papers are ſeized who is diſtreſſed by it, but every perſon in the leaſt connected with him, may by the moſt accidental circumſtances imaginable be involved in the conſequences. Theſe go to the friend and the friend's friend, and, in ſhort, it is impoſſible to ſay what may be the extent of their influence.

I doubt not but there is ſome legal method

of recovering papers, as well as any other goods, which are unlawfully detained from the right owner; but I am ſure the remedy muſt, from the nature of the thing, be very ineffectual, if it was leſs tedious and troubleſome, than I dare ſay it is, as well as all other proceedings at law. The miſchief and damages occaſioned by the ſeizure of papers muſt in every caſe be very great, in many infinite, and irreparable; ſuch as no conſideration, no reſtitution can compenſate, no ſatisfaction indemnify.

Papers relate to the affairs of buſineſs and property; the advantages, title, and ſecurity of which depend upon them; but that is not all. Every man, who has papers, has his ſecret and confidential correſpondences; his private ſtudies, reſearches, and purſuits, whether of profit, entertainment, or improvement. His *papers* contain all theſe. The merchant has his ſecrets of trade; the philoſopher his diſcoveries in ſcience. Every accurate man has the impenetrable ſecret of his circumſtances; the ſtate of his affairs. Many have their WILLS, *ſettlements*, and diſpoſitions of their eſtates, ſealed up in ſilence, not to be broke, but with their own heart-ſtrings. Theſe are to be found among their *papers*. A man's riches may be there in things known to none but himſelf; and his poverty may

from

from thence *only* appear, the unſeaſonable diſcovery of which may involve him in irreparable ruin. *Papers* are the depoſitories of our fortune; the truſtees of our credit, character, and repuation; the ſecretaries of our pleaſures. They are our cloſeſt confidents; the moſt intimate companions of our boſom; and, next to the receſſes of our own breaſts, they are the moſt hidden repoſitory we can have. Our honour and fame, our eſtates, our amuſements, our enjoyments, our friendſhips, *are*, and even our vices *may be*, there: things that men truſt none with, but themſelves; things upon which the peace and quiet of families, the love and union of relations, the preſervation and value of friends, depend. Secrets that may coſt a man his life; ſecrets (of which there are many) that tho' they can neither affect life nor liberty, yet ſome men would rather die than have diſcovered; the revealing of which may render life inſupportable, may diſſolve every tie of nature, looſen every bond of ſociety, and put an utter end to the comfort of exiſtence.

It is for theſe reaſons, that wiſe men not only keep their papers with the greateſt care, but at convenient ſeaſons purge their repoſitories, and deſtroy thoſe that ought not to be preſerved, after the immediate purpoſes of them are anſwered. They have above all,

a ſpecial care into whoſe hands their ſecret papers ſhall come, after they are dead: a precaution that every man owes not only to himſelf, but to his family and friends, perhaps to his country.

But what need is there to enlarge upon ſuch a topick? Every man's own mind will repreſent the thing to him in a ſtronger light, than any language can convey. Let any perſon, the moſt private and the leaſt employed, or concerned, in buſineſs, ſtudy, or correſpondence, pauſe only a moment, and conſider if he would chooſe to have his cloſet ranſacked, his moſt private repoſitories rifled, his papers carried he knows not where, and expoſed to he knows not whom. Let him likewiſe reflect, that in this matter every man is dependent upon another, in a ſingular, but unavoidable manner, to an unſpeakable, but inextricable degree; and that every perſon may in a great meaſure, or to an equal effect, ſuffer the ſame inconveniencies from the misfortunes happening to his friend, as if it had befallen himſelf: ſo that in proportion to the extent of a man's connections, and correſpondence, is he expoſed to this hardſhip, and to all the miſchievous conſequences of it.

The moſt ſuperficial thought upon theſe things will ſuperſede the uſe of any argument to convince mankind of the important miſchiefs attendant on a SEIZURE OF PAPERS, or to ſatisfy

ſatisfy them, that perſonal liberty itſelf is not an object of greater concern than the ſecurity of repoſitories is to moſt men.

Is it not then abundantly provided for? It is to be hoped, that it *is* by the law of the land; but it would ſeem the preſent practice of the Secretaries of State's Office pays no regard at all to it; if what has been publiſhed to all the world be true. It has not been contradicted; on the contrary, it is acknowledged.

The Parliament, to make private correſpondence ſacred, has enacted that a ſingle letter ſhall not under the higheſt penalties be opened at the Poſt-office, without an expreſs warrant in writing from a Secretary of State, in whom that particular power is lodged, as one of the firſt Miniſters of Government. What ſhall we ſay then, when we hear that a perſon (it is of very little conſequence who, but it does not leſſen the importance of the conſideration, that he is a MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT) has had ALL HIS PAPERS SEIZED, without information upon OATH, by virtue of a VERBAL ORDER of a Secretary of State, whoſe powers as a Magiſtrate (in which character only he acts in this inſtance) are no higher it ſeems, than thoſe of a Juſtice of Peace: an ORDER which the Secretary of State commanded to be carried into execution at MIDNIGHT, though the meſſenger had either too much humanity

or

or too little confidence in his authority, to obey that part of the order; or perhaps had a greater value for his life, than to expoſe it in ſo mad an exploit, as a midnight entry into a man's houſe without ſo much as the pretence of a warrant *naming the owner*.

THE PAPERS have been carried to the Secretary of State's Office; and there (as your own letters intimate) they have been thoroughly examined. The news papers have already publiſhed ſome of the privacies contained in them. Is this LAW? Is it LIBERTY? Is it GOVERNMENT? Or is it TYRANNY and OPPRESSION? If it is LAW, where is LIBERTY? If it is NOT LAW, where is the VOICE of LIBERTY?

BUT can there be SUCH LAW, in this FREE COUNTRY? One cannot ſurely read it in the CONSTITUTION; and if it is in the ſtatute book, or in the record of any court in the kingdom, it ought not to remain a moment longer capable of being quoted to diſgrace the BEST form of GOVERNMENT, and diſquiet the FREEST PEOPLE. No Engliſhman till he ſees it read or is informed of it, can believe that there is ſuch a law in this LAND OF LIBERTY. SLAVERY itſelf could hardly endure it. It muſt be the HEAVIEST BONDAGE, even where there is no FREEDOM.

To explain the miſchievous nature and oppreſſive tendency of ſuch a law, if there

were any ſuch, is paſt the power of words. To exaggerate the enormity of ſuch proceedings, would be to inſult the loweſt underſtanding in this country, where the GENIUS OF LIBERTY reigns. Such acts are little ſhort of SACRILEGE.

We are however told by one Perſon in your office that every ſtep was taken by the *attorney* and *ſolicitor general's* advice. THAT cannot be; for the moſt ignorant conſtable in Weſtminſter could have inſtructed your Lordſhips that a VERBAL ORDER was a warrant for NOTHING; and it is inconceiveable how you yourſelves could have thought otherwiſe. Another champion of power, who calls himſelf a *moderate Whig*, vindicates the whole proceeding by ſaying with a perſpicuity peculiar to his own ſtile, "The length of time and ſeveral precedents "*may not* conſtitute an act ſtrictly legal, which "*may not* be literally ſo, *(theſe are his own* "*unintelligible words,)* yet it will acquit thoſe "who act conformable to precedents before "uncontroverted, and believed to be legal, "from any deſign of acting illegally, in the "opinion of every honeſt man."

How there can be a precedent, unleſs in unauthentick memory, for a *verbal order*, is not ſo eaſy to be underſtood. This inſtance will make none; for no body doubts of the illegality of it. The precedents of the

ſecretary

ſecretary of ſtate's office however, if there was a cart load of them, are of no authority. If they have never been controverted, then it only appears that they have not *yet* been judicially diſputed. Hitherto, it is to be feared, it has been too much *fragili quærens illidere dentem*, now it may be found to be *offendet ſolido*. The regiſter of Sir John Fielding's warrants deſerves to carry more weight with it than the book of the ſecretary of ſtate's office. If *that* was ſent to your office for a copy book, your Lordſhips, or at leaſt your ſucceſſors, would not hereafter cauſe any perſon to be apprehended by a WARRANT that NAMES NO BODY; which of itſelf is an offence for which a Chief Juſtice in a former reign has been impeached.

This ridiculous talk of precedents is ſhocking to the firſt idea of a FREE GOVERNMENT. They ought not to be once mentioned. They muſt at the name of LIBERTY ſhrink back into the gloomy caverns of tyranny, where ſuch vulcanian thunder-bolts only could be forged; as ſpectres retreat to their diſmal ſhades at the words of a true exorciſm.

There is indeed hardly any thing ſo wicked, or unconſtitutional, but a precedent may be found for it, if the records of the ſtar chamber, or the memorials of tyranny, are reſorted to as authorities. The great ALGERNON

ALGERNON SYDNEY, whoſe valuable blood prepared the ſoil for receiving the ſeeds of the GLORIOUS REVOLUTION, was executed for high treaſon; and the overt act for which he died on a profane ſcaffold, was that precious MANUSCRIPT found in his cloſet, which never had been publiſhed, and was not completed; the hand writing of which was not proved, a fiftieth part of it not produced, nor even the tenth part of *that* allowed to be read at the trial.

But *in whoſe reign* was this cruel tragedy acted? In the BLOODY reign of *a Stuart*, Charles the Second, an unhappy prince, who ſacrificed the lives of the very people who called him from exile, to the fury of his deſpotiſm, and who ſold the honour of his crown for a penſion to ſupport his infamous pleaſures.——Who condemned the noble MARTYR of liberty? That arch traitor of his country, the moſt infamous inſtrument of regal tyranny, and a very butcher of his own ſpecies, Lord Chief Juſtice JEFFRIES of ROTTEN MEMORY.

Look to the reigns of a glorious WILLIAM, who nobly reſcued and happily reſtored, and of the ILLUSTRIOUS GEORGES, who to their immortal honour, have built up, this INVALUABLE CONSTITUTION; PRINCES who have read the value of ENGLISH LIBERTY in the luſtre of the Crown which

IT placed upon their heads; PRINCES who have eſtabliſhed the ſecurity of the PROTESTANT SUCCESSION in their own auguſt family upon the ſame baſis with the ENVIED FREEDOM of THESE NATIONS; the pillars of which are not to be ſhaken.

From *theſe reigns* can there be produced a a precedent of *legal authority* for *ſuch* a SEIZURE OF PAPERS as has happened lately? Do their days ſo much as furniſh an *allowed* example of the fact to the ſame extent? It may be doubted if in the very worſt of times, when arbitrary principles were riſing to the top of the precipice, from which at laſt tyranny fell head-long with its own weight, ſuch things were *avowedly* practiſed under the *ſhew* of authority; whatever *mere power*, or rather *force*, as irregular in its acts, as unconſtitutional in its foundation, might perhaps do.

But what was the pretence of this late violation of rights ſo ſacred in their nature, this invaſion of property, in a critical point, which comprehends every valuable intereſt a man can have? A perſon is ſuſpected of being the author of a printed paper, which, in the judgment of the Secretaries of State, was a ſeditious libel, and the proof of the fact is to be ſifted out of his *own* papers: for your Lordſhips have ſaid in your letter, which is publiſhed, that ſuch of the papers ſeized, as

tend

tend to make out the guilt of the owner are to be kept, and uſed for that purpoſe.

The reaſon is moſt inadequate, and muſt appear ſo to every man, who is not beat out of his ſenſes by the jargon of lawyers, or confounded in his own ideas with the quibbles of legal nonſenſe.

If there is a circumſtance that can aggravate the injury, which is in itſelf too great almoſt to be conceived, it is this uſe that is to be made of the papers; and nothing can ſo much add to the ALARM which the practice of SEIZING OF PAPERS muſt give to every man.

When a perſon is brought upon his trial for any offence, he is not bound, nor will any Court ſuffer him to give evidence againſt himſelf; but by this method, if allowed, though a man's tongue is not permitted to bear teſtimony againſt him, his thoughts are to riſe in judgment, and to be produced as witneſſes to prove the charge. A man's WRITINGS lying in his cloſet, NOT PUBLISHED, are no more than his thoughts, hardly brought forth even in his own account, and, to all the reſt of the world, the ſame as if they yet remained in embrio in his breaſt. When ALL a man's PAPERS are ſeized, he is at the mercy of his proſecutors. Some may be uſed to prove a charge, when others, which are *ſuppreſſed*, would clearly exculpate him

him of guilt. It was thus in the infamous proceedings which robbed that hero of patriotiſm, the great SYDNEY, of his life. *Scraps* of an *unfiniſhed manuſcript* were the evidences upon which he was condemned, when the reſt of that very writing was not produced.

The rack itſelf is hardly a more inhuman mode of accuſation, or tyrannical method of proof. Both are equally againſt the firſt laws of nature; and nothing can be more unlike the benign ſpirit of our happy conſtitution.

In caſes of treaſon papers are ſeized, though even *then* it is always done with much circumſpection, and under many reſtrictions as to the uſe to be made of them; but *that* proceeds upon a quite different principle, a principle of ſenſe and reaſon.

Treaſon, in the general nature of it, muſt be the crime of *many*. It implies plots and conſpiracies, which are carrying on by correſpondence, and are to be diſcovered by *papers*. The ſafety of the State, which is ſuperior to every other conſideration, makes it neceſſary, to uſe all poſſible means to unmaſk the machinations of *treaſon*, that the dreadful effects may be prevented. *Papers* therefore may be ſeized, and letters intercepted, as arms, ammunition, and other warlike ſtores may be ſecured, that the ſinews of rebellion may be cut. This is the ſole

reaſon,

reaſon, and end of ſeizing *papers*, in a *treaſonable* caſe, although they may afterwards be uſed as proofs of ſuch *overt acts* of *treaſon* as they are connected with, or bear relation to, ſo as to make them be conſidered as a part of the proſecution of the ſame *treaſonable* purpoſes; yet ſurely it cannot be law even in caſes of *treaſon*, nor (we hope) ever was law, with any but ſuch a judge as Lord Chief Juſtice *Jeffries*, that *papers* found in a man's cloſet, *not publiſhed*, and unconnected with any thing but themſelves, can conſtitute a crime, or be brought as a proof of guilt.

What *does* however hold in *treaſon*, will not take place in other caſes. There is a certain neceſſary rigour and ſeverity in the laws of *treaſon*, which would be cruelty, if extended to other crimes. Many things are allowed in the caſe of treaſon, that, if applied to other matters, would be more miſchievous in their conſequences than the things they were intended to prevent.

It is *treaſon* to compaſs or imagine (as it is called) or, in plain Engliſh, to contrive or intend the death of the King, if it can be proved by any overt act; and it could be no more than *treaſon* actually to put the ſovereign to death. It is not however murder, *in foro humano*, to intend, or even to attempt to kill another man. There is

therefore no example to be drawn from what *is* or *may be* done in caſes of *treaſon*, to any other caſe; and none can be more unſimilar to it than that of libels.

Publication is eſſential to a libel, and the criminality is intrinſic in itſelf. The offence, and the effects of it, both ſtand upon the libel *alone*, unconnected with any other thing whatſoever. There is not therefore the leaſt colour of danger, or neceſſity, to plead for breaking through any right, or any privilege of the ſubject, for the ſake of diſcovery or prevention, in ſuch a caſe; much leſs to trample upon thoſe rights that are the moſt ſacred and inviolable, and the conſequences of injuring them pernicious beyond expreſſion. The evil is great; the miſchief apparent. The utility and good is nothing, or ſo inconſiderable, as to be no object at all.

To the mercy of *any* government even convicts may have ſome claim; the benignity of *ours*, guilt itſelf cannot forfeit. Its ſuavity, and mildneſs, in proſecutions and trials, can be denied, or interrupted to none. Suſpicion, or accuſation, do not annul the rights of innocence; nor rob the ſubject, either of the protection, or *favour* of the laws. The *lenity* of juſtice is, in England, its *dignity*. Fair trials, and *gentle* proſecutions, are the peculiar glory of this country;

and

and no man ſhould be deprived of any benefit, or advantage, his own ſilence, or the ſecrecy of papers *not publiſhed*, can afford to protect him againſt conviction. As he can keep his mouth ſhut, ſo his privacies ought to be ſacred, and his repoſitories ſecure.

But if the partitions of a man's cloſet, (which is but another boſom,) are to be wantonly broke down, on every ſlight pretence, or trivial occaſion, and what lies there locked up in ſecrecy, things that the world never ſaw, and no man has a right to look upon, are to be expoſed at the humour or malice of every, perhaps trading, juſtice of peace, (for ſo far it goes,) let the moſt partial determine what muſt be the conſequences. There is an END OF LIBERTY, an end of confidence amongſt mankind. A ſevere reſtraint is laid upon friendſhip and correſpondence, and even upon the freedom of thought. In ſhort, a FATAL BLOW is given to the moſt precious and valuable rights of mankind; to the faireſt privileges of ſociety. The thing is big with miſchiefs innumerable, and inconceivable; the leaſt of them not to be laid in the balance with all the danger of any *libel* the moſt ſeditious that can be publiſhed, or with any thing leſs than *high treaſon* itſelf, which does, and juſtly ought to overcome all rights what-

whatſoever of any individual, be the conſequences what they may. If care is taken in that caſe, that no harm be done which can poſſibly be avoided, nor any unneceſſary hardſhips inflicted, it is all that can be expected, and as much as ought to be required.

Precedents of ſeizing the *papers* of printers, and publiſhers, are comparatively ſcarce worthy having any notice taken of them in a juſt and accurate conſideration of this ſubject. The papers and repoſitories of every private perſon ſtand upon a very different footing. If amongſt *theſe* any diſtinction can be made, it is due to the caſe of MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT, for the ſake of their TRUST, and of the intereſt their conſtituents have in their freedom, ſecurity, and independency. On theſe all our valuable rights depend; and they cannot be expoſed to a greater or more dangerous INFRINGEMENT than an undue SEIZURE OF PAPERS. It has always, for this reaſon, been the GREAT OBJECT of the HOUSE OF COMMONS, to protect the Members of Parliament from ſuch illegal invaſions.

The public may, perhaps, be thought to have ſome more power over thoſe, who are a ſort of ſervants of the public than over *private* perſons; and profeſſed publiſhers (in the caſe of publications) are a

ſort

ſort of public perſons. Their ſhops and offices, therefore, are in ſome ſenſe, and to a limited degree, the houſes of the public.

Theſe kind of people, however, all the world knows, are ſoon frightened, and intimidation ſpeedily checks them. Miniſters know it; and therefore they uſe it without ſcruple, and without mercy, when *they* think fit. How far that is conſiſtent with the LIBERTY OF THE PRESS, or for the advantage of the public, is another queſtion.

The authority of a ſecretary of ſtate, even a hint from the office, and much more apprehenſions, examinations, and menaces, will ſoon conquer theſe poor men's ideas of liberty, and make them fond to redeem themſelves. They are very ready to purchaſe exemption from a hard, expenſive, and dangerous proſecution, directed by power and carried on from the public purſe, at the expence of ſubmitting to acts illegal, and oppreſſive, for which a court of law, and an Engliſh jury, would give ample redreſs and ſatisfaction. No ſtreſs whatever can therefore be laid on ſuch inſtances, if any can be cited; but, at any rate, precedents of *fact* are not at all, or in any caſe, to be regarded. LEGAL PRECEDENTS are thoſe whoſe authority ſtands upon trial, and judicial deciſions of courts of law, in TIMES OF LIBERTY, and JUSTICE.

If there have been any examples of undue *ſeizure of papers*, ſo far from being precedents to *juſtify*, or even to *excuſe* the practice, they afford the ſtrongeſt reaſon in the world for giving a timely and effectual check to it; that it may no longer continue to be the *grief* and *burthen* of the ſubject.

Precedents which have the *ſhew* of authority, from the ſanction of courts, though of arbitrary and unjuſt judges, in times too of tyranny and oppreſſion, can only be mentioned to be ſcorned, and inveighed againſt, in days of LIBERTY and JUSTICE; or to be ſet up as beacons to warn againſt the ſhipwrecks, which the rocks and quickſands of arbitrary power have occaſioned, in former ages.

But in the halcyon days of LIBERTY, when JUSTICE is adminiſtered with PURITY, care will be had to avoid precedents of *ſeeming* authority, to give to proceedings that are *arbitrary*, and oppreſſive, the appearance of being *legal*. It is the more neceſſary to do it, becauſe precedents of ſuch times will have weight from the character of the times. Bad and illegal precedents of *fact* cannot be too ſoon, nor too ſeverely corrected; not only for the honour of the government, and the preſent ſecurity of the ſubject, but that they may not remain to be quoted in ſucceeding,

ſucceeding, and in worſe times, if ſuch ſhall ever be the curſe of this country, except as authorities *againſt* any attempt to imitate the practices formerly condemned, and effectually to prevent their being renewed or repeated.

EVERY TRUE FRIEND OF LIBERTY therefore will anxiouſly deſire to ſee this queſtion have a fair trial, that he may know exactly how the law ſtands, and be fully apprized of his danger; ſo that all may provide againſt it the beſt they can. If on every pretence or ſuſpicion of a libel, or of what not only a ſecretary of ſtate, but the loweſt magiſtrate of the peace, may pleaſe to deem one, in which POLITICS, PARTY, PREJUDICE, and RESENTMENT, will always have a great influence, OUR HOUSES, and our FRIENDS' HOUSES, are to be OPEN at all hours and under all circumſtances to every prowling officer of the crown, actuated by curioſity, intereſt, deſign, or revenge, he will be the wiſeſt man that correſponds the leaſt with others, and the moſt prudent who writes very little, and keeps as few papers as he can by him. None but a fool in this caſe will have any ſecrets at all in his poſſeſſion.

That no ſuch BADGE OF SLAVERY does *yet* exiſt in this country, is ſtill believed. That it never may exiſt will naturally be the wiſh of every ENGLISHMAN.

Extract from the Letter from Albemarle-Street to the Cocoa-Tree.

EVERY good man wiſhes the whole nation were agreed in Revolution principles; and if we are one, in that reſpect, our name muſt be one. The fire of conteſt might then, without preying on the vitals of national happineſs, waſte itſelf in the diverſity of political attachments, and ſtruggles for power; the diſputes about which, are the natural offſpring of a free conſtitution, and generally conducive to its vigour, as changes in it are oftentimes neceſſary to promote the public good.

In a country like this, when men of ſound principles contend for influence, (and if they do not, it can only be becauſe there is a penury of great ſtateſmen, which is a ſign of ſtagnation, rather than a mark of health, in the political body;) they muſt not only be rivals in abilities, but emulate each other in zeal, and attention to the general welfare; which is the fair road to elevation, and the only ſtability of preferment, in popular, and mixed governments.

Our national parties ſprung up, with their unhappy names of diſtinction, in days when the encroachments of the Crown threatened the ſubverſion of the conſtitution. James I. taught

taught a ſyſtem of prerogative, conſiſtent with nothing but ſlavery; and his deſcendants, corrupted with his falſe principles, obſtinately purſued his perverſe plan, to their own ruin. The unbridled attempts of arbitrary power neceſſarily produced oppoſition, then reſiſtance, and at laſt ended in the expulſion of a race of tyrants; a ſucceſſion of which had diſgraced the throne, and all but deſtroyed this country, when their own family fell the miſerable victim of their irreclaimable attachment to deſpotiſm.

If there are yet amongſt us any wretched remains of thoſe parties, they are the tattered rags of a direful warfare, between the ſtretches of prerogative and the defence of liberty; between the faithful friends of a limited, mixed monarchy, and the traiterous advocates of abſolute, and arbitrary ſovereignty: a diſpute, one ſhould think, too unnatural now to be brought back from the dead.

The diſagreeable diſtinctions that heretofore have prevailed, muſt be placed to the account of the times, and the circnmſtances of the nation; but the fortunate change in theſe ſhould now ſoften into general harmony all former animoſities, and eradicate unnatural, and deſtructive prejudices. If there is a diſtinction, let it only be between honeſt men, and thoſe who do not deſerve the

the name; between thoſe who will do any thing for ſomething, and thoſe who will not, on any account, do what ought not to be done. Let the honour and intereſt, the glory and proſperity of the nation, the juſt power, and true dignity of the crown, and the rights of the ſubject, be, as in truth they are, the common cauſe; and the principles of allegiance, and liberty, the cement of adherence to it. Thoſe who, from any motive, can deſert that cauſe, or deny thoſe principles, will, with their country, ſtand in the light in which their own criminal and contemptible conduct ſo juſtly places them.

If the Houſe of Commons ſhould relinquiſh the right, or decline to exerciſe the power of *reſolving* with the dignity, and authority of parliamentary declarations, upon points of high concernment to the liberty of the ſubject, and eſſential to the preſervation of our freedom, eſpecially in the caſe of violations in the perſons of their own members, they would ceaſe to be the grand inqueſt of the nation, and ſurrender one of their higheſt truſts.

For parliamentary reſolutions are not like the words of a *drunken porter*, ſay ſo who will.—[In the debate on General Warrants, Sir Fletcher Norton ſaid, he ſhould pay no more regard to a reſolution of the Houſe of Commons,

Commons, than to the words of a drunken porter in Covent-Garden.]—One ſhould think ENGLAND could not have bred a man, I had almoſt ſaid a —, who would talk in ſo ridiculous a manner: and no body has more reaſon to ſtand in awe of parliament, than ſuch as are capable of holding a language ſo diſreſpectful to IT, ſo derogatory to the great SECURITY of the NATION. It muſt proceed from ignorance of the conſtitution: and to confute the nonſenſe, would be ſuppoſing it is not what it really is. Lawyers, who are generally fettered with the trammels of their profeſſion, may ſay, as they ſometimes have ſaid, that votes of the commons are not conſidered as laws—"Nevertheleſs, (as the author of the beſt conſtitutional hiſtory of England ſays,) ſuch is their effect, that *few perſons are ſo hardy* as to act directly contrary to theſe deciſions of the commons, ſince it is, in ſome meaſure, to oppoſe the ſentiment of the people whom they repreſent. Beſides, an action directly contrary to a vote of the houſe, is liable to be queſtioned, when leaſt expected, and draws upon the actor the indignation of the houſe." It may alſo be remembered, that there are not wanting inſtances of parliaments declaring things done againſt liberty, *heinous crimes*, even in an *Attorney General*.

The object in view was not barely to condemn

condemn general warrants without name: for that the Houſe of Commons did, even in the reign of Charles II. and impeached a Chief Juſtice of England for granting them; though the revival of the practice loudly called for a freſh check to ſo dangerous an evil.—Depriving the ſubject of his liberty without a charge upon oath, or ſomething as ſtrong, is equally illegal.—Cloſe confinement for a bailable offence; arbitrary evaſions of the habeas corpus; and above all, the unwarrantable ſeizure of papers; were objects highly worthy the weightieſt interpoſition, and an adequate puniſhment.

We deſired reſolutions to vindicate the principles of the conſtitution, and invigorate the nerves of liberty; to ſhew that a due ſenſe, and a becoming regard to it, inſpire the repreſentatives of a free people: that the juſt apprehenſions of thoſe who chooſe them, to be their defenders and protectors, are not to be treated as the dreams of fancy, or the murmurs of ſedition; nor the voice of freedom diſregarded as the language of riot, or curbed as the petulance of faction: that the fundamentals of liberty are not to be taken up, only to be laid aſide as things of no moment, and ſhuffled into the heap of unimportant, and impertinent matter, that compoſes the dreg of public conſultations, and the refuſe of free debate.

Judicial

Judicial reſolutions of Parliament, ſeaſonably interpoſed, in vindication of the conſtitution, not in gratification of men's paſſions, partialities, and reſentments, upon great and general doctrines of magnitude ſufficient to draw out its ſupreme juriſdiction, are the known, the natural, ſafe, and (notwithſtanding the bold ſcorn of any officer of the law, however high), the moſt operative protection of liberty. Theſe reſcue, and reſtore things to their right condition: they do not create, or enact, but actuate, and aſcertain what already has a real exiſtence, and ought to be in full vigour: they brighten, and illuſtrate the principles of the conſtitution, that threaten to languiſh, and fade; they quicken, and enliven thoſe that are in danger of decay, and annihilation.

You, the WORTHY gentlemen of the Cocoa-Tree, have honourably diſtinguiſhed yourſelves among the friends of liberty. Your country, with gratitude, proclaims your merit; and the voice of liberty will loudly ſound your praiſe. Welcome into the boſom of a free people, and to be numbered amongſt the beſt CITIZENS! You have followed the example of the venerable heroes in the cauſe of liberty, to whoſe courage in the ſenate, and the field, we owe the preſervation of the conſtitution, the maintenance

maintenance of our freedom. You have but to perſevere in the ſame glorious path, and your fame will be recorded with their immortal renown.

Could you deſire a nobler teſtimony to your ſervices than one you have? You ſhare the large applauſes of ſo many brave patriots, who on the ſame trying occaſion, with undaunted boldneſs, contended for the juſt rights of their country. Amongſt the foremoſt ſtands a gallant general, pointed out for ſupreme command, by the unanimous voice of his grateful country; in whoſe manly ſpirit, a well-tempered mixture of generoſity, and frugality, ſecures the foundations of true dignity: renowned for his proweſs, more diſtinguiſhed yet by his patriotiſm; who truly poſſeſſes that ANIMUS IN CONSULENDO LIBER, *neque delicto, neque libidini obnoxius:* a brave ſon of Mars, who follows not alone, but accompanied by many, his ſpirited companions of the war, wherever liberty leads; who pleads her cauſe at home, with the ſame ardor that he fought her battles abroad; wreathing the laurels of the camp with the garlands of the ſenate; who thinks, and ſhews, that honour is not confined to military ſervice, but is equally ſacred in all ſituations, and in all capacities. There is fortitude which deſpiſes danger, and defies

diſmiſſion; the independent ſpirit that makes the MAN; the magnanimity which crowns the HERO;—the bold ſoldier, the intrepid ſenator, the fine gentleman, the warlike advocate for liberty! England has a CONWAY, the powers of whoſe eloquence, inſpired by his zeal for the object, animated with the fire of true genius, and furniſhed with a ſound knowledge of the conſtitution, at once entertain, raviſh, convince, conquer.

Such noble examples are the riches of the preſent age, the treaſure of poſterity.—*Sæpe audivi civitatis noſtræ præclaros viros ſolitos ita dicere*, CUM MAJORUM IMAGINES INTUERENTUR, VEHEMENTISSIME SIBI ANIMUM AD VIRTUTEM ACCENDI.—*Scilicet non ceram illam neque figuram tantam vim in ſeſe habere; ſed memoria rerum geſtarum, eam flammam egregiis viris in pectore creſcere, neque prius ſedari, quam virtus eorum famam atque gloriam adæquaverit.*

The honeſt, and ſpirited, conduct of the ſound part of the Cocoa-Tree, has done much towards reducing the ſtate of parties to that ground on which a diviſion cannot long ſubſiſt, or effect great harm. The banner of prerogative, which was wont to be the much-loved regal enſign, will not now triumph over the ſtandard of liberty, which always was the favourite enſign of the people.

If

If honeſt men, that have been called Tories, are upon the ſame bottom, and of the ſame principles with honeſt men who act like Whigs; the ignominious remainder of either name may call themſelves, or be called by others, what they pleaſe. Their conduct will ſtamp their character, the original of which is of an older date than any party name now exiſting, and will continue long after time has blotted out the remembrance of the worſt of them.

For the laſt fifty years, the Tories have called themſelves the patrons of the people; and the Whigs thought they were the defenders of liberty, the ſupport of the proteſtant ſucceſſion, and the pillars of the conſtitution. If the characters were real, the difference between them was to ſeek. But unfortunately they differed in their opinions of each other, not without cauſe, or they might long before now have been happily united, and the names of diſtinction annihilated.

Two reigns of the Houſe of Brunſwick have not, that I know of, afforded a debate upon any real queſtion concerning the liberty of the ſubject. The reaſon is obvious that the favourite object of their government was more amply to ſecure it.

An important queſtion of liberty, however, brings characters to the teſt, and tries the

ſincerity

ſincerity of former profeſſions; it elucidates principles, and unmaſks pretences. Thoſe who ſtand forward in that glorious cauſe, are the true patriots, the ſound whigs, come from where they will, and whatever name they go by. They breath the ſpirit of the revolution, and ſtrengthen the bands of our ſecurity. Formerly the only diſtinction has been, (but it muſt no longer continue to be ſo,) between *country gentlemen* and *courtiers:* it is now betwixt *the friends of liberty*, and *the ſlaves of power*. Arthur's, or the Cocoa-Tree, Albemarle-ſtreet, or St. James's, are not able to confound *things* under a *Babel* of *names*. St. Stephen's Chapel itſelf cannot chriſten thoſe that are againſt liberty, *Whigs*, or thoſe that are for it, *Torys*, as long as we can read the principles of the revolution without the help of treaſury-opticks. The diſtinction between Whigs and Tories was founded in the ſtruggle between prerogative and liberty; a Tory therefore who befriends liberty is a contradiction; the character, excluding the name: by parity of reaſon, a nominal Whig, who is againſt liberty, is equally inconſiſtent, the conduct being incompatible with the appellation.

A rank Tory is bad; but a rotten Whig, if poſſible, is ſtill worſe. The firſt has the credit of conſiſtency, if it is his original principle, and he has never quieted his

ſcruples with the profits of compliance. The other is a renegado, who renounces his convictions; forſakes his firſt love; and cuts off the breaſts that nouriſhed him. With whom theſe gentlemen ſhould aſſociate, I am at ſome loſs to know. Their only fit companions ſeem to be rotten Tories, who retain their principles, or rather their prejudices, and make gain of changing their profeſſions. Let rotten Whigs and rotten Tories then, go together; and who will envy their ſociety? But an Adminiſtration, ſupported by ſuch a confederacy, muſt indeed be of a very black hue; and its continuance may be judged of from the rotteneſs, fragility, and incoherence of its props. Nor need any that comes after be afraid of wanting the ſame aſſiſtance, if they have a job to do, which better men will not undertake. Thoſe of ſuch flexible tenets, and pliable diſpoſitions, will always be help at hand, ready to offer their ſupport, upon proper terms, and eaſily turn with the tide; being *very accommodating in their nature*.

The favourite cry has, of late, been, to aboliſh all party names. But managed as it is, I know nothing, that has tended more, than this very cry, to revive, and keep up, what moſt people were very ready to forget. I own, however, I am for the propoſition, but I wiſh to go a great deal farther. For extinction

extinction of names will go a very ſhort way to a coaleſcence of parties. It is beginning at the wrong end. The axe muſt be laid to the root of the tree. Let us cut up the foundation of the difference: names will, like the ſhadow, follow the ſubſtance. Till we have but one principle, we cannot be of one name.

No body, I dare ſay, ever thought; and no friend to his country ever could think, of proſcribing men for a *name*; or of barring the converſion of the rankeſt Tory that ever exiſted. I am ſure the practice has been the contrary. Witneſs the liſt of honours, and offices, in the laſt reign; witneſs how many, who had been called Tories, not to ſay even real Jacobites, were well rewarded for coming into court, where their deſcendants now flouriſh, with the additional comfort, of daring to avow, and act, upon the ſame principles of prerogative, and arbitrary power, which their anceſtors were paid for pretending to renounce. The fathers, by a fearful hyprocriſy, made their own terms; and, like the prodigal, always got the beſt garment.

The great miniſter, who conducted this country to a pitch of glory it never ſaw before, made it the labour of his adminiſtration to extinguiſh parties, as well as names: and it is a merit, that cannot be denied him, that he was more ſucceſsful in the patriot deſign, than

than perhaps any of his predeceſſors were, or than any but himſelf will, for a long time, be.

When he was at the helm, there ſeemed to be but one heart, and one mind, in the nation. His conduct commanded an unanimity ſo aſtoniſhing in degree, and ſo amazing in its effects, that thoſe who are now diſpoſed to find fault, though their own acquieſcence made part of the general conſent, can only call it an *intoxicated unanimity:* a reflection which does as little honour to themſelves who now pretend to murmur, and did not before remonſtrate, as it does juſtice to the true ſpirit of the nation, which then was ſatisfied, and ſtill is content with what was before univerſally approved. Unhappy is it for this country, that ſome of the labourers fainted before the harveſt was gathered!

Honeſt men did then as they do now; for integrity is a conſiſtent character. On the ſame principle of love to their country, they ſupported her liberty againſt foreign enemies, and defended it from domeſtick violations. In the days of concord, even the rank Tory, and the reprobate Whig;—the moſt rotten-hearted of either name were dragged along with the ſtandard of liberty, as the trophies of a triumphant adminiſtration, the meaſures of which ſtilled the voice of oppoſition, and ſilenced the whiſpers of complaint. Men of all

all denominations and characters went one way, becauſe there was not another road open. When an opportunity offers, principle and pay ſcreen the multitude: the ſound and the ſordid, the ſycophant and the ſincere, then part: proſpects, promiſes, and proviſion, draw away the hungry, the greedy, and the gaping: virtue can only carry the virtuous and upright. When thoſe who carry the *bag* ſhew the way, the *feeling* intereſt will always be on that ſide.

Mark, however, the importance of the character of conductors; the greatneſs of the difference between Tories when compelled to follow a Whig Leader, and when making a true Tory ſyſtem. We have ſeen Tories, under Whig conduct, ſupporting Whig meaſures, and adopting Whig maxims: if ſuffered to act on Tory principles, we perceive liberty can only be ſafe, by keeping out of their reach. Tories, when they take the lead, will wound, not protect her, if ſhe comes in their way.

We had a Miniſter; alas! that we have not him ſtill; who has not only ſaid, but ſhewn that it was the pride of his heart to humble the foreign enemies of his country, and who thinks he cannot ſpend the laſt remains of his health in a better cauſe, than ſtruggling to maintain the great barriers of the conſtitution, aſſert the rights of the ſubject,

and protect their liberty againſt arbitrary violations. It was the ſingular commendation of that GREAT Miniſter's adminiſtration, not only to be aſſiſted by all the zealous friends of their country, and of the conſtitution, but to be oppoſed by none. He ſtudied to unite parties, without confounding principles; not ſingly to make names ceaſe, but to get opinions to coaleſce, upon the great foundation of revolution principles: and certainly he had the ſatisfaction to effect an unknown union and harmony, in the counſels and operations, the wiſhes and deſires of the kingdom; no leſs honourable to himſelf than advantageous to the nation, and beneficial to all Europe.

[*After giving an account of the ſtate of the national finances, as they ſtood at the time; the noble author concludes with the following obſervations.*]

The words *æconomy* and *reformation* having loſt their meaning; or rather meaning only extravagance and corruption beyond example. The people juſtly alarmed for their liberties, attacked in their perſons, their property, and even their houſes, by the arbitrary violations of general warrants, and aggrieved by the moſt odious mode of exciſe.—The tools of power, oppreſſive in their proſecutions; more oppreſſive ſtill when proſecuted themſelves, and legally convicted—ranſacking every deteſtable artifice for delay, every infamous chicanery,

chicanery, *eſſoign*, privilege, bills of exception, the frowns of power, immenſity of expence, &c. &c. under all which diſcouragements, and hardſhips, the meaneſt of the people have had to contend for almoſt a twelvemonth, and ſtill muſt contend, with the greateſt, who are one day encouraging and paying defamatory libels; the next, beat at their own weapons, *under frivolous diſtinctions*, flying to law; and, leſt that ſhould fail, to Parliament, for the means of ſuppreſſing and puniſhing what was only the bleſſed fruit of their own example.—Such is the candour and generoſity of our reformers, ſuch the liberty and licentiouſneſs of the preſs.—

A ſet of men diſtinguiſhed by nothing but publick and private blemiſhes, even in the exceſs of them—poſſeſt of the reins of government—and ſweets of office, preſent and reverſionary—preſuming to give law to their ſovereign in the moſt inſolent manner—under the ſpecious colour of delivering majeſty from a pretended intention of the ſame kind of tyranny in others, who truly *feel* for the honour of their maſter, who never had in the late reign, or in this, a ſuperiority of influence, but from ſuperiority of talents and ſervices to their King and Country, and who have ſcorned to give themſelves even the trouble of contradicting that prepoſterous heap of abſurd

falſhoods, palmed, ſo induſtriouſly, upon the public credulity, laſt autumn, certain that they would die, and ſtink, like their authors, in the noſtrils of every honeſt man: a ſecond ſeſſion of parliament almoſt elapſed ſince the ſignature of the preliminaries, without ſo much as one ſtep taken, however promiſed, towards ameliorating our revenue, or availing ourſelves, by wiſe, and careful regulations, of thoſe *ceſſions*, the utility of which has been ſo highly magnified; and which are only as yet known to us, by the accumulation of expence; or the ſolicitations we hear ſo much of, for proprietary grants of the moſt valuable of them, to gratify friends and favourites of power, aſtoniſhed as they are at their own exaltation, they are content to drag on, like a wounded ſnake, a weak, diſgraced, diſreputable exiſtence; when they are conſcious there is but one ſet of men, who can give luſtre to government, and in whom alone foreign Princes, the Bourbon confederacy excepted, will, or can take a juſt confidence.—What character for ability, weight, or credit, has, or how can ſuch an adminiſtration be looked upon, either abroad or at home?

With a civil liſt of no leſs than eight hundred thouſand pounds per annum, [1764,] the *crown* revenues of all our conqueſts, *all* the revenues, and *all* the intereſt of the late King's

King's riches, in Germany, now flowing in with the arrears, in what light of ſplendor does our Court appear in the eyes of the nation—in the eyes of Europe? I will not appeal to enumerations, which I am aſhamed to recapitulate, and which a very *ſhort* memory, indeed, can recollect.

If this be a true delineation, and you know it is, of the public ſituation at this time, where can ſuch of you, Gentlemen of the Cocoa-Tree, who have ſhewn yourſelves the ſtrenuous and hardened ſupporters of ſuch meaſures and ſuch principles, look for a juſtification of your conduct?—Can you ſtill hope to impoſe upon mankind? Or, rather, are you not diſcovered, and known to be the tools of prerogative, and enemies to the principle of revolution freedom?—Can you, after this expoſtulatory account of things, have the aſſurance to continue in your affirmations, that the preſent Miniſters have as yet *done nothing wrong?*—Merit for them, I muſt do you the juſtice to acknowledge, you never have claimed.—Will your miſrepreſentations ſtill preſume to lay to the charge of the leaders of the friends of liberty, a thirſt, like your own, after employments?—Men who have, almoſt all of them, filled, and ſacrificed the greateſt ſituations, to the love they bear their country—Will you continue to do this, when you know in your conſciences,

the moſt probable fear is, that if the wiſhes of the public ſhould ſucceed, an unhappy unwillingneſs will manifeſt itſelf, inſtead of an intereſted eagerneſs, to fill the high offices of the kingdom.

Theſe important conſiderations are left with thoſe of the Cocoa-Tree, who prefer principles to names, reality to profeſſions; who are miſcalled Torries, and are *indeed* friends to that ſyſtem of liberty, which was founded in the expulſion of the Houſe of Stuart, and ſecured by the acceſſion of that of Hanover, under which their title being founded in freedom, it is our own fault if we are not free.

I am, &c.

Extract from the Principles of the late Changes, impartially examined.

[*A letter which appeared in the news-papers of the 20th of July*, 1765, *pretending to give an account of the change of Adminiſtration which took place at that time—The removal of Mr.* Grenville, *and the appointment of Lord* Rockingham, *after Lord* Temple *and Mr.* Pitt *had refuſed; gave riſe to this tract.*]

OUR Author, ſpeaking with the dignity of the plural number, gives us what he calls

our

our beſt intelligence of the cauſes of *the diſmiſſion of the late Miniſters*, and the *choice made of the preſent Miniſtry:* and to thoſe who know any thing of the facts to which only he can allude, particularly as to the alledged faults of the late Miniſtry, which is the key to the whole; this cannot appear to be a miſrepreſentation of his true meaning, whatever his words are. "The late Miniſters wickedly rebelled againſt Lord Bute, who claims the merit of making them, and expected from them the homage and obedience due to a *Creator:* their inſolence became inſupportable; their behaviour was *ſuch* as could no longer be *ſuffered*; their *provocations muſt be got rid of at any rate*; therefore they were diſmiſſed *inſtantaneouſly*, (which by the by is a great ſtory, for it was long before it could be got done.) Now you their ſucceſſors, you have yourſelves been great tranſgreſſors, in refuſing ſubmiſſion: but you are *pardoned* and received into favour, not indeed for your own ſakes, but as neceſſary inſtruments to chaſtiſe thoſe whoſe crimes were beyond forgiveneſs; having been found the only ſet who would come in, without which they could not be turned out. However, have a care: if you return to your old tricks, or tread in your predeceſſors' ſteps, mark the end that is before you; therefore *grow wiſe* by example; and if you would eſcape their fate,

fate, in whoſe place you are come, follow not their evil courſes. If you do, there will be found thoſe who will do juſtice upon you alſo, if they ſhould be brought from all the ends of the earth: rather than want hands to execute the provoked vengeance, there will be taken ſtragglers from all Parties, that is the moſt worthleſs of all men: for *in ſuch a caſe, I hope,* (ſays our Writer,) *even thoſe very Parties, which often owe their ſtrength to ſtrange and unnatural connections, would not be ſo deſtitute of men of integrity and capacity, as to deprive the King of all means of forming a Miniſtry on true principles of Patriotiſm, and conſequently perfectly agreeable and conformable to his own.*"

I have no doubt, the man means that it is the *Favourite*, who is to form ſuch a glorious adminiſtration as he ſpeaks of; and upon what *principles* it will be done *by him*, we have already had ſufficient proof: but from ſuch poiſon as *his* Patriotiſm has appeared to be;—from Miniſters, whoſe *integrity* conſiſts in conforming to *his* principles, defend us!

Such, I ſay, is the real language of this Writer, and it is indeed the language of truth. I know he ſays, *the late Miniſters flew in the face of their Royal Maſter*; but that is only his manner of ſpeaking. The facts decide here. Was there ever greater zeal than the late Miniſters manifeſted, for what they called

called the honour of the King, though a great part of the nation thought it was no ways concerned in the affair? And perhaps they could produce very good proof, that they did not at that time contradict the Royal pleaſure. They brought a load upon themſelves, by the violent proſecution of that cauſe, which had well nigh overſet them. But can any man ſpecify an overt act of the late adminiſtration, that was ever ſo much as inſinuated to be a ground for the charge of flying in the face of the King, or in which his mind was forced, till the buſineſs of the Regency Bill came in hand?

That, 'tis true, brought to light ſome part of the dark ſcenes, and gave a peep through the curtain. But before that time, the heads of the adminiſtration had been ſuſpected of ſubmitting to the influence of Lord Bute: they were called his deputies and delegates. Their defence againſt that accuſation, often made, was that they abjured him; and had even *ſtipulated his removal* not only from the King's councils, but from his *reſidence*, when they undertook his ſervice in their own perſons. They ſtated themſelves to be in *reality* what they were *officially*, the King's Miniſters, *and reſponſible* as ſuch: they found themſelves at laſt obliged to ſay, and they did it publicly, that they thought it was as neceſſary as fit, in order to carry on the public buſineſs,

buſineſs, that thoſe who had the charge of it ſhould have their maſter's confidence; and that it was neither decent nor expedient, that great meaſures of government, highly intereſting to the commonweal, ſhould be concerted and planned without the participation of thoſe who, by their offices, are anſwerable both for the propriety and the ſucceſs of the King's counſels. They believed ſomething more was due to them than juſt to be *called* upon to execute and carry through what others, to whom it did *not* belong, and with whom they had no communications, adviſed, and projected. Can any one deny this to be the language of ſenſe, and reaſon, and the nature of the conſtitution?

If the manner in which the affair of the Regency was produced, the hiſtory of which is now no ſecret, gave theſe Miniſters room to think the King's confidence was not where it ought to be, the event has juſtified their opinion. But what was their conduct on that occaſion? They would not reject a ſalutary meaſure, becauſe they were not the firſt adviſed with upon it: they adopted the ſcheme with all that duty that it became ſubjects, as well as ſervants, to receive the motions of the King's paternal care of his people and family: they even admitted a part of it, which, whoever adviſed, gave bad and hazardous counſel to the Crown; and

they

they are hardly to be excuſed for yielding, I dare ſay againſt their opinion, to a deviation from the only compleat model upon record, of the moſt recent and reſpectable authority, in ſuffering a propoſition to be made for an unexampled encroachment upon the moſt inherent, moſt fundamental, and moſt eſſential rights of Parliament, and a dangerous precedent for an addition to the pretenſions of the Crown, by entruſting to the ſole and ſecret nomination of the Prince upon the Throne (who may not always be ſo worthy of confidence as his preſent Majeſty) the appointment of the perſon to exerciſe the regal authority for, it may be, not only a long minority, but an unhappy ſucceſſion of them. Will this Writer himſelf ſay that, in this inſtance, the late Miniſters *flew in the face of their Royal Maſter?*

Does he then mean that they did it, by an amendment that was made upon the firſt draught of the Bill, and was authoriſed by a meſſage ſigned with the King's own hand, only to give the Princes of the blood a *certain* place in the council of Regency, as the great offices of State do to thoſe who hold them? This, I can conceive to have been thought a flying in the face of the Favourite, who was thereby put to wait till a vacancy ſhould happen in the number, before he could be *named* one of the Council.

But as the amendment was an indiſpenſable act of juſtice and of duty to the Royal Family itſelf: ſo for the preſent diſappointment it occaſioned to Lord Bute, of a *primary object* of the bill as *firſt concerted*, perhaps to be a ſort of eventual entail of power or influence; I believe the late Miniſters may, with great ſafety, take their trial by their country.

If the Writer of the Letter thinks there yet remains to ſupport his charge of *flying in the face of the King*, the other amendment made to obviate a doubt ſtarted concerning the extent of the Royal Family, in regard to the capacity of being Regent, he may pleaſe to recollect, that the doubt which forced the amendment, did not ſpring from any member of the adminiſtration, and though the Secretary of State who brought in the Bill, did afterwards propoſe the amendment, which was unanimouſly agreed to, he did it not till after he could have, and certainly had the communications, which were underſtood to be his authority for offering the alteration; nor even quite ſo ſoon as he might, after he had theſe: for ſo far was *he* from being precipitant, that our Letter-writer may have information from Lord Bute himſelf, that he, ſitting in the houſe, preſſed Lord Halifax to propoſe the limiting words a day before he did it,

and

and for this reaſon did he preſs it, as he himſelf ſaid, that it would make an end of the debate, and becauſe he knew he *then* had the authority for doing it. There is ſurely therefore, as little ground for the charge in this article; and if the amendment was afterwards conſidered as diſagreeable any where, and therefore cauſed to be amended, perhaps, with more *of indelicacy* than of true *reſpect* both to the King, and his family, the Miniſters ſhewed themſelves ready and zealous to enforce and make effectual the ſuppoſed compliment to his —— becauſe it was urged under that notion.

The annals of the late adminiſtration do not furniſh another act which our Author can charge to his purpoſe, except the removal of Mr. Mackenzie, the brother; and of Lord Holland, the coadjutor, and truſty counſellor of the Favourite, unleſs it be that they agreed all to go out together, rather than any one of them to enliſt under Lord Bute's banner: which I fancy the Writer of the Letter has an eye to, as one of theſe *ſtrange and unnatural connections to which Parties often owe their ſtrength.*

Theſe removals, and eſpecially Mr. Mackenzie's, I have admitted was *flying in the face of the Favourite:* it touched him in the apple of his eye, and was both the ſign and the completion of *Rebellion* againſt him

him: the Miniſters thereby declared open war againſt *that* influence, and avowed they did ſo. But when was this done? Not till after the ſtorm of Lord Bute's vengeance had broke upon their heads for daring to deny their dependence upon, and preſuming to renounce allegiance and ſubjection to him. They had got their diſmiſſion, though the counſels of the ſecret adviſers were ſo prepoſterous, that no proviſion was made for a ſucceſſion of the Miniſtry.

The Miniſter, as his reward for concluding the buſineſs of the ſeſſion, was to forward his own removal, by an adjournment of the Parliament, till an arrangement of ſucceſſors could be ſettled. Their places were brought to market: but they bore no price: there were no bidders. Then they were called back, and, if what is generally ſaid be true, at the very moment that a treaty was ſtill going on with offers of the adminiſtration to others, not cloſed, but even continued after the recall. Thus ſaved, if it could be ſo called, only becauſe none were then found to take their room, they once more took a freſh leaſe, as they had done, after the like negociation, in September 1763, and the ſacrifice of Mr. Mackenzie, ſealed the new bargain, which was inſiſted upon for the declared purpoſes that have been mentioned.

They

They went no farther, and it was going no great length; far from carrying things with a high hand, when the humiliation muſt have been enough almoſt to admit of any thing. It was a ſort of a further trial to enforce the *pacta conventa* againſt the *Favourite's* influence, the infractions of which they had ſeen and felt.

This, to be ſure, had the appearance of giving a blow to the Favourite: but the wounded ſerpent, from the inſtant, rallied his ſtrength, and returned to the charge; and one moment was not loſt, from the time of the apparent reconciliation and re-eſtabliſhment of the old Miniſtry, till their total overthrow was accompliſhed. The interim was a perfect *ſede vacante*, nothing done, nor indeed could be done in ſuch a ſituation, except giving away ſome things that fell, by the diſpoſition of which the Miniſters could not but ſee the power was departed from them. So that it may be truly ſaid, Mr. Mackenzie's removal was almoſt the laſt act of the late Miniſtry.

For this fact, clearly, they were executed, when their reprieve expired. Neither their public conduct, nor the private characters of any of them, had the leaſt hand in their deſtruction: They did not die for *violations of liberty*; to expiate *general warrants*, *ſeizure of papers*, *reſtrictions of* the

the *Privilege*, and *ſecurity* of *Parliament*; reſtraint on the *Freedom of the Preſs*, *rigorous crown proſecutions*; *informations* for *conſtructive contempts*; *eſſoins*, *privilege*, and other *obſtructions* to the *courſe* of *juſtice*. Theſe, with all their attendants and conſequences, whether juſtly or unjuſtly laid at their door, does not matter to the preſent purpoſe, were blaſts which they had weathered: and they could not with any reaſon come as charges, at leaſt from the grand enemy.

It was not their *unpopularity*, nor *Canada Bills*, the *Manilla ranſom*, the *Demolition* of *Dunkirk*, encroachments in the *fiſhing* of *Newfoundland*, or diſturbances in the ſettlements on the coaſt of *Africa*, nothing of the *foreign ſyſtem*, or *domeſtic management* of affairs, that haſtened theſe Miniſters to their end. They were not offered up to the *complaints*, the *cries*, nor the *wiſhes of the people*. Neither were they victims to the reſentment of *foreign courts*, as ſometimes has been the fate of Miniſters: for the Miniſters reſident here, from thoſe powers, whoſe averſion would not be a bad rule for our choice, were fooliſh enough at the time openly to ſpeak out their apprehenſions of a change, declaring, in a manner as inſolent as indecent, but that ſhould indeed give us a leſſon, if we had ears to hear, that

that their courts would conſider the reinſtating of Mr. P. as little ſhort of a declaration of war, and would prepare themſelves accordingly.

The late adminiſtration had not failed in what is commonly called the King's ſervice: one ſeſſion was got over after another; a great and growing majority; deſerters daily coming in; following the *loaves* and the *fiſhes:* and oppoſition dwindled into nothing, by the impatience, unſteadineſs and incapacity of its rotten part.

If this be a true ſtate of the caſe, and in truth it is, let any ſound thinking perſon only aſk his own mind, what reflections it preſents to him? What comfort does a change of adminiſtration for ſuch a cauſe, under ſuch circumſtances, and by ſuch inſtruments, miniſter to the people of England? Can it give any ſatisfaction even to thoſe who moſt wiſhed for a change of Miniſtry? Men long to ſee government once more reſume its wonted ſtability and dignity: even the fooliſh thirſt of novelty has almoſt been ſatiated, we have had ſo many changes: I believe the ſeals have one way or other ſhifted hands eight or ten times within theſe two or three years. But at this rate nothing can be permanent.

There was a wiſh for a change of the Miniſtry: but a change on ſuch a principle

as this has been made is only more to be regretted, than the continuance of the thing, that was itſelf diſliked. Parties produce changes, and we expect them as the natural effect of a natural cauſe; nor do we deſire to be without parties to occaſion changes. I do not mean parties in *principle*, which are diſtreſs and ruin; but parties in *opinion*, in friendſhips, connections, and attachments. Parties of that ſort are but ventilators to fan the conſtitution, and purify adminiſtration. They overturn one another by ſuperiority of ſtrength, excellence of ſyſtem, or advantage in abilities: and while theſe things hold the balance of power, oppoſition will itſelf be a means of ſafety, and an inſtrument of the public good. The conteſt muſt both regulate and eſtimate the contenders: and the riſe and fall of Miniſters, in ſuch a caſe, will moſt probably be for the true intereſt of the nation, as thoſe will prevail who have the moſt influence, that is, ſtand beſt by their country, are ableſt to ſerve her, and adopt the moſt approved meaſures.

But when a *Favourite* lords it over every thing, all Parties are loſt in the *vortex* of his power, all alike debaſed and ſunk. Nothing can ſhine but from the reflection of his favour: ſycophants and paraſites only aſcend: all contention is occupied in ſtudying his will, and courting his ſmiles. He chooſes

chooſes thoſe who will beſt ſerve *him:* and inſtead of actors, we have puppets: the Miniſters of the Crown are the ſlaves of a minion; obedience to whom is the only teſt of fitneſs, and ſuppleneſs the beſt qualification for employment. This we have ſeen fully verified before our eyes.

The fall of the late Miniſtry, proves what it was that made them ſtand ſo long againſt all the external ſhocks they ſuffered; it ſhews what will make any *other* undergo the ſame fate that they, at laſt, did. They lived by permiſſion, and were extinguiſhed by a puff of the ſame breath that gave them exiſtence.

The beſt adminiſtration has leſs ſecurity againſt this *inviſible power* than the worſt; and there can be no good one that will not ſin after the ſimilitude of that offence which proved mortal to the laſt. This ſecret lever will move the ſtrongeſt building that does not reſt upon the odious foundation of *Favouritiſm*. In September 1763, one ſhake was given; but as there might then be hopes, the judgment was ſuſpended, to try the fruits of that ſevere admonition to repentance: in May 1765, the ſtroke was more violent, becauſe the iniquity was by that time come to a deſperate height: and laſt of all, the meaſure being full, the execution of the ſentence of exciſion could no longer be delayed.

There are Miniſters whoſe energy the nation has experienced, and to them their confidence is attached. They deſire to ſee the glorious names reſtored, that can give weight to our counſels, and force to our treaties: whoſe credit will engage the alliances of our friends, and their terror awe the diſpoſitions of our enemies. Theſe might preſerve peace abroad, and bring back domeſtic tranquillity; ſettle things upon a ſound bottom, and improve the ſtate of quiet, to make proviſion for the evil day, when the clouds that are always gathering may chance to break. The remonſtrances and repreſentations of ſuch Miniſters would not need to be often repeated in any court in Europe. But while their inflexibility, and the Favourite's power continues, our hopes are cut off.

One might naturally enough aſk here, what guarantee the preſent Miniſters have got? Have they gone to the only office there is to enſure them? Or do they take the riſk upon themſelves?

This Writer tells us, thoſe, now in the great poſts of the kingdom, owe their preferment to Lord Temple's declining, and to the *Duke of B—df—d's continuing in ſuch a behaviour, as no private man could have ſuffered in any one of his inferiors.*

So far I muſt agree with this Writer, that

the choice of the new Miniſtry was *involuntary*. Certainly others refuſed before they had it in their power to accept. Even they themſelves, we are (to ſpeak in our author's ſtile) *aſſured*, did refuſe only thrice before they accepted: not indeed, it may be believed from any reluctance to batten upon the good things of government, but from a conſciouſneſs, that in theſe circumſtances, it was likely to turn as little to their own account, as it ſeemed to be for any good purpoſe to the publick.

So often, if what is ſaid be true, and it has not been denied, did the new Miniſters decline; and, as it is added, they very earneſtly preſſed the firſt recuſants to ſerve under the Favourite's undeniable lieutenant, who was originally held out as the general under whom they were to enliſt. A better proof could not be given, that they only deſired to profit of greater ſtrength than their own, to ſecure a portion of office to themſelves.

Theſe things are by no means new. It is rarely we ſee men great enough to decline the employments of the State, when the means are not left of ſerving their country. But more commonly we find people out of office, only becauſe they cannot by any means get into it: and *theſe* are always ready to run into Court on the firſt opening of the door; leaving behind them all they profeſt,

profeſt, when without, that they may be the more nimble for their new ſervice. This was remarkably the caſe three and twenty years ago—[1742]—and has been often ſince, upon ſimilar occaſions. It is therefore no wonder it ſhould be ſo now. It will always be the ſame, with the ſame perſons, as long as they live, and with all of a like ſort. The only maxim many are governed by, is to follow the carcaſe, as *all ravens* do. Weather-cocks and *ſtop-gaps*, even to a nick-name, are ever at hand: and the example of the old teaches the young:

Sic placet. An melius quis habet ſuadere? ſecunda
—— *Ratem occupare quid moramur alite?*

Thus has an eagerneſs to *have* overcome the fears of *taking*, and the ſuſpicions of not *being able to hold:* and thus we have got a Miniſtry *in ſpite of itſelf*, if I may borrow the words of the Letter: *a new Miniſtry* begot by the Favourite's reſentment againſt the *old*, upon the *hunger* of their ſucceſſors; and by many yet thought to be little better than *ſtill-born*. It is however, the *form* of a Miniſtry, or will be, if it gets time to be compleated. How the *Promethean* fire is to be brought down from heaven to animate it, I know not.

Our complaint againſt the new Miniſters is not for what they have done, but that nothing has ever been done by them, to give

give us room to expect any thing from them; and that they have undertaken what they confeſs they are not able to do. At this rate, we may take half a dozen grenadiers out of the guards, and make Miniſters of them, and with this ſort of language amuſe the people, till the nation is undone.

The tone was the ſame when Lord Bute took the lead, with his *choſen* Chancellor of the Exchequer. Give him but a trial; do not judge him before he has done good or evil. We have ſeen, and ſhall ever have reaſon to lament the effects of that *bleſſed* adminiſtration. But there is this difference too between the two caſes: thoſe who were hired to trumpet Lord Bute's praiſes, cried him up as a man of incomparable (though they were then unknown) abilities. He had formed the King, and none fitter to govern the State. Theſe people are ſo much the more wonderful in their exceſs of folly, that they confeſs, and proclaim their own ability. They bear witneſs againſt themſelves, and their witneſs muſt be true: out of their own mouths they are condemned.

Did they not refuſe the adminiſtration over and over again, becauſe they owned they were not equal to the charge? Whence got they their new light? Their language ever ſince they came into office, is a wiſh that Lord Temple and Mr. Pitt would relieve

relieve them of the weight they cannot ſuſtain.

We have ſeen in our own day, the likeſt thing to an interregnum in adminiſtration, an abſolute blank in the Miniſtry, the King keeper of his own Seals for three months: but as it was a ſingular incident, and marked a very extraordinary ſituation of affairs, ſo it produced indeed marvellous effects—an adminiſtration of unparalleled harmony, and the moſt firm and glorious that ever exiſted; the fame of which will reſound to the lateſt ages, as long as there remains a faithful page of hiſtory to record its illuſtrious acts. There was at leaſt as little hazard of late, as at the period alluded to, if an unaccountable fatality had again driven us to ſo uncommon a chaſm. The wound would ſoon have cloſed, without leaving a ſcar where the ſhaft paſſed: and the conſequences might have been deſirable and happy, as in the former inſtance.

An ignorant or unſkilful ſteerſman cannot be leſs perilous, and will probably be more deſtructive, than the want of one altogether. Of the firſt the event ſhall tell: the laſt needed not at all to have been the caſe, and would not have been it long; though theſe generous-hearted gentlemen had not flown ſo haſtily to the rudder. Little was required of them: it was only to let it alone; the fitteſt thing, at any rate, for them to have done. Had they been

been wiſe enough to have taken that part, it needs no divination to ſay, and it may without any doubt be affirmed, what would have happened. The malady would ſoon have worked its own cure: all obſtacles would have been effectually removed; and an adminiſtration ſettled upon a ſound bottom, ſatisfactory to the people, and for the real benefit of the nation.

We know the Cabinet has been poiſoned with Lord Bute's ſyſtem; and that this has been one of the great obſtacles in the way of getting back to the public ſervice thoſe Miniſters to whom the eyes of all England look. Indeed the ſyſtem was taken up, as the beſt method of expelling them, in order to compaſs Lord Bute's great object, of engroſſing the whole power of this country into his own hands: and difficult as it might have appeared to be, to fall upon a ſyſtem that could have inverted the ſtate of this country, in the midſt of the unanimity and ſucceſs, in which Lord Bute found us, when he firſt came upon the political ſtage, he was wonderfully ſucceſsful in his attempt, to get poſſeſſion of the reins of government.

For that Lord Temple and Mr. Pitt were forced from the King's counſels, by an advice of which the declaration of war againſt Spain was a moſt ample vindication, though it was a laboured apology for oppoſing it. *For that*

the

the Duke of Newcaſtle, after having been induced to concur in chaſing away Mr. Pitt, was himſelf diſmiſſed with ignominy, to leave in ſole poſſeſſion the Favourite, whom his Grace had thought fit, *by an act of his own*, to bring into a miniſterial office, to counterbalance the weight of Mr. Pitt. *For that* we got a *glorious* peace, and *bought* from *ourſelves* an approbation of it, *becauſe* we were not able to carry on a war, the ſucceſſes of which had almoſt made an end of its expence. *For that* we diſſolved our natural alliances abroad, and renounced all connections with the common cauſe of Liberty, and the independency of Europe, *becauſe* we are powerful enough to ſtand alone, againſt the moſt formidable union we ever ſaw of our enemies. *For that* a door was opened without diſtinction at home to all the enemies of the K—'s family, *becauſe* that was the only way to root out Jacobitiſm, and to introduce into places, thoſe who ſeemed to think the adminiſtration of a Stuart, to which their *new* loyalty was confined, was the next thing to a reign of that name. *And with all theſe* Lord Bute might, for ought I know, have yet been the Miniſter *himſelf*, if his want of courage had not done more for us than our own virtue.

ORIGIN

ORIGIN OF HEREDITARY NOBILITY.

THE celebrated civilian, Francis Hotoman, who was one of the moſt learned men of his age, gives us the cauſe of making hereditary the order of Nobility in France. In his work, entitled *Franco-Gallia*, which is now very ſcarce, written in the year 1574, he ſays,——

"We muſt not omit making mention of "the *cunning device* made uſe of by Hugh "Capet, for eſtabliſhing himſelf in his new "dominion.—[Of King of France, *anno* 987.] "For, whereas, all the magiſtracies and "honours of the kingdom, ſuch as Dukedoms, "Earldoms, &c. had been *hitherto*, from "antient times, conferred upon *ſelect* and "*deſerving* perſons in the general conventions "of the people, and were held *only during* "*good behaviour*; whereof (as the lawyers "expreſs it) they were but *beneficiaries*: "Hugh Capet, in order to ſecure to himſelf "the affections of the great men, was the "*firſt* that made thoſe *honours perpetual*; "which were formerly but *temporary*: and "ordained, that ſuch as obtained them ſhould "have an *hereditary* right in them, and might "leave them to their children.—Of this, ſee

"Franciſcus

" Franciſcus Conanus, the civilian, comment " ii. chap. ix."

It is ſingular, that this fact has eſcaped the notice of moſt of the French hiſtorians.

Account of the Duel between Mr. WHATELY *and Mr.* TEMPLE.

From the Public Advertiſer, *of September* 4, 1773.

AS Mr. George Whately, the banker, has hitherto declined diſcovering how the letters of Meſſrs. Hutchinſon and Oliver, Governor and Lieutenant-Governor of New England, were obtained by the Boſton faction, (by which his conduct appears highly problematical, if he is innocent,) permit me to communicate, through the channel of your paper, the ſtory he circulates in private, although he chuſes, for reaſons beſt known to himſelf, to withhold it from the public.

Mr. Secretary Whately died in June, 1772. In the October following, a native of Boſton, reſident in London, not a hundred miles from Great George-ſtreet, applied to Mr. George Whately for ſome letters he had formerly written from America to his deceaſed brother. The banker immediately produced ſeveral parcels, containing letters from different American gentlemen, particularly Meſſrs. Hutchinſon

Hutchinſon and Oliver. The wily Boſtonian, who is an inveterate enemy to the above gentlemen (a circumſtance then unknown to Mr. Whately) next aſked his permiſſion to peruſe their letters, to which Mr. Whately, not ſuſpecting any harm, readily conſented. The Boſtonian was then left in the room alone until he had ſatisfied his curioſity. Mr. Whately does not charge this Boſtonian with having conveyed away any of the above letters, but he abſolutely avers that no other perſon had acceſs to them from the time of his brother's death to this inſtant. When therefore this Boſtonian's *character*, as well as *former* conduct in life, his *inveteracy* to the letter writers, as well as his *cloſe connection* with ſome of the leading men in oppoſition at Boſton, are fully conſidered, I believe that no one will be at a loſs to unravel this myſterious affair.

From the ſame of November 25, 1773:

To Meſſrs. BERNARD, KNOX *and* MAUDUIT.

GENTLEMEN,

HAD I not been in the country, the refutation of your joint performance would have appeared ſooner. Though I was not the immediate

immediate inſtrument of bringing to light thoſe letters which have opened a ſcene of villany almoſt incredible, yet I am ſo particularly acquainted with that tranſaction as to affirm, you have falſely and wickedly adduced Mr. Whately's authority, to charge it upon ſome gentleman living in or near Great George-ſtreet. Why you ſhould fix upon a gentleman there particularly, I cannot conceive, unleſs it be that ſuch a gentleman had the honour of detecting the malefactions of the corrupt Bernard, and bringing him to ſhame.

To put you to ſilence at once I affirm, that the letters which were ſent to Boſton, have not ſince his brother's death been in the poſſeſſion of Mr. Whately, the banker, whom you ignorantly call *George*. Let him contradict me if my aſſertion be untrue.

If it would anſwer any public purpoſe, the gentleman, who really procured thoſe letters, and whom, with all your little low united cunning you will never diſcover, would not heſitate to declare himſelf. At preſent he is content to enjoy in concealment the approbation of all good men, for having diſcovered the wicked authors of thoſe incendiary informations which threatened the deſtruction of both countries. The ſubtle ſpies, the ſecret traitors ſtand now confeſt; and the mercenary motives of their conduct are manifeſt. The Americans

are

are fully ſatisfied, that the ſevere meaſures of this country aroſe from theſe miſinformations, which, joined with a conviction of our having been impoſed upon, has produced a mutual turn to reconciliation. Theſe are the happy conſequences of the detection of thoſe letters; conſequences which *you*, who have laboured equally with their wicked authors, *to arm the parent hand againſt the child*, moſt cordially lament.

The natural union will now be reſtored—England will return to her old good-humour, America to her former reverence and affection, commerce will again flouriſh, and we ſhall ſtand together the bulwark of religion and liberty againſt the world in arms. The Bernards and the Hutchinſons will be the propitious ſacrifices to ſeal this union, and render it immortal.

To you, Gentlemen, theſe events are as hateful in proſpect as they will be fatal in reality. You live only in the unnatural contention between the two countries. Your intereſts therefore, as much as your malignities, prompt you to ſtir it up; and to purſue thoſe with unremitting rancour who endeavour to compoſe it.

Were it poſſible your induſtry could point out the man who really furniſhed to America thoſe letters, from which ſuch benefits will happily flow, it would ſerve only to fix the

gratitude of the public upon its proper object. The public would erect a monument to him, borne upon the ſervile heads of Bernard, Hutchinſon, Oliver, and Knox. It would thus ſtand as a perpetual memorial, that his reputation was raiſed upon the baſeneſs and turpitude of the common enemies to England and America.

A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

To the GENTLEMAN *who ſigns* A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT.

AS the Gentlemen, whom your Membership has thought fit to honour with your correſpondence in the Public Advertiſer of November 25, do not ſeem to think your compoſition worthy of an anſwer, I preſume, from ſome knowledge I have of the matters on which you found your epiſtle, to addreſs you.

You pretend indeed not to be "the immediate inſtrument," but only privy to it. But, ſay you, that privity enables you to affirm that theſe letters were never in Mr. Whately's hands ſince his brother's death. Mr. Whately cannot poſitively diſprove your aſſertion, for you know the very nature of the tranſaction precludes any poſitive evidence. Such evidence, however,

as

as the matter will bear, Mr. Whately has given in the following account, which, to the beſt of my recollection, correſponds in every material circumſtance with the account which Mr. Whately's candour and politeneſs has induced him to repeat to ſuch Gentlemen as have applied for information how theſe letters came to be publiſhed.

'Some time after the late Mr. Whately's 'death, Mr. John Temple applied to Mr. 'Whately the Banker, telling him that he 'was a correſpondent of his late brother, 'and has he had in the courſe of the cor-'reſpondence expreſſed his opinion upon 'ſeveral regulations propoſed in America, 'he wiſhed to peruſe them again, as he 'expected to be called upon by the Miniſtry 'to give his ſentiments upon that ſubject. 'Mr. Whately brought into the room a 'large file, indorſed *American Letters*, and 'gave them into Mr. John Temple's hands 'to look over, who ſaid, "I ſee here are "letters from Governor Hutchinſon and "Mr. Oliver, and ſhould be glad to ſee "what they have wrote upon the ſame "ſubject." Mr. Whately gave permiſſion, 'and being preſently after called out of the 'room, left Mr. John Temple peruſing the 'letters. After a ſhort time, Mr. Whately 'returned into the room, when Mr. Temple 'thanked him for his politeneſs, and went 'away.'

Mr. Whately has alſo ſaid, that no man but Mr. John Temple has had any acceſs to this file of letters ſince his brother's death. I mean only to relate a plain ſtory, and whether it is to be ſuppoſed that any of theſe letters have been taken out of the file or no, or whatever other conſequences may be deduced from it, I leave to your Membership and the reader.

New-England Coffee-houſe, ANTENOR.
Nov. 29, 1773.

From the PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

HAVING read in your paper of this day an imputation upon my character under the ſignature of ANTENOR, I called on Mr. Whately the Banker, whoſe name is mentioned, to know whether he had authoriſed that charge, or avowed the truth of the *pretended* facts on which it is founded. Mr. Whately totally diſclaimed them, and denied that he had authoriſed any perſon to uſe his name, or knew the writer. I then read to him the ſtate of facts relative to me in the ſaid paper; all of which he acknowledged were falſe, except that, about a year ago, he gave me ſome letters of my own, written to his late brother when Secretary

Secretary to the Treaſury; and that we had *together* read ſome other letters from Gentlemen in America, but none of thoſe lately publiſhed of Meſſrs. Hutchinſon, Oliver, Paxton, &c. which Mr. Whately aſſured me he had never ſeen till they appeared in print.

Anonymous attacks are not to be regarded; but if no notice were taken of them when names are mentioned, *concealed villains* might in ſome meaſure anſwer their infamous purpoſes.

Great George-Street, J. TEMPLE.
Dec. 8, 1773.

From the Same.

I HAVE hitherto declined publiſhing any thing relating to the letters of Governor Hutchinſon, Mr. Oliver and others to my late brother, and my intention was not to interfere in print on the ſubject, nor have I been privy to, or know the authors of any of the paragraphs or letters that have found their way into the papers on the occaſion; but Mr. Temple by his publication of this day appears to me to make me a party in ſuch a manner as calls upon me to ſtate the proceeding between us, leſt my ſilence ſhould be conſtrued as an aſſent to that

publication. Mr. Temple began the converſation that paſſed between us yeſterday by aſking if I was privy to the letter under the ſignature of ANTENOR? I aſſured him I was not, nor did I in the leaſt know the author. He proceeded to point out ſeveral particulars in the ſtate of facts as contained in that letter, and to which he objected; ſuch as his declining to re-peruſe his correſpondence with my brother, as having therein expreſſed his opinion upon ſeveral regulations propoſed in America, and being expected to be called upon by the Miniſtry to give his ſentiments upon that ſubject; whereas one particular letter from himſelf, with a paper annexed to it, was the object of his ſearch; nor did he aſſign as his motive his expectation of being called upon by the Miniſtry to give his ſentiments on any ſubject, and that the letters produced to him by me were ſaid to be on a large file; whereas they were contained in ſeveral parcels; and that after a ſhort time of abſence, upon my returning into the room, Mr. Temple is ſaid to have thanked me for my politeneſs, and to have gone away; whereas he ſtayed and dined with me. To theſe obſervations, on the part of Mr. Temple, I was far from making any objections; and that every one may form ſuch judgment as may be thought proper, I beg

leave to relate every tranſaction between Mr. Temple and myſelf material to the preſent point.

Some time about the month of October in the laſt year Mr. Temple applied to me, and informed me that he wanted particularly to ſee a paper relating to the colonies he had formerly tranſmitted to my brother, with a letter from himſelf accompanying it, and that he believed ſome of the letters of Governor Hutchinſon, Mr. Oliver, and others of my brother's friends in America, might probably afford ſome light into the object of his inquiry. Unknown almoſt as Mr. Temple was perſonally to me, I deemed the friendſhip my brother had conſtantly ſhewn him intitled him to every aſſiſtance in my power for the purpoſe deſired, and I therefore made no ſcruple to place that confidence in him as to lay before him, and occaſionally during his viſit to leave with him ſeveral parcels of letters from my late brother's correſpondents in America, in the exact ſtate in which they had come into my poſſeſſion; ſome regularly ſorted, and ſome promiſcuouſly tied together; and among them were ſeveral from Mr. Temple himſelf and his brother, and from Governor Hutchinſon, Mr. Oliver, and others; and during the intervals that I was in the room with Mr. Temple, we did together caſt our

eyes

eyes on one or two letters of Governor Hutchinſon, and I believe one or two other correſpondents of my late brother. In July laſt I received information from Mr. Oliver of Boſton, that ſeveral letters to my late brother had been laid before the Aſſembly of the province; upon which I waited upon Mr. Temple, and told him I thought myſelf intitled to call upon him to join his name with mine in aſſerting the integrity and honour of both of us; that he and he only had ever had acceſs to any of the letters of my brother's correſpondents in America, and that I was called upon to account for the appearance of the letters in queſtion. Mr. Temple aſſured me in terms the moſt preciſe, that (except ſome letters from himſelf and his brother, which he had from me by my permiſſion), he had not taken a ſingle letter, or an extract from any I had communicated to him. I ſaw him twice afterwards on the ſame ſubject, and the ſame aſſurances were invariably repeated by him, and confirmed by him in the moſt ſolemn manner.

The facts as above ſtated with reſpect to Mr. Temple's peruſal of my brother's letters I have related freely to whoever applied to me for information, and given every body authority to quote me on the occaſion; and I have as freely repeated the aſſertions and aſſurances Mr. Temple has conſtantly given

me

me with reſpect to himſelf; and there the matter at preſent reſts. As to the publication under the ſignature of ANTENOR, I know not who is the author, I ſhall only obſerve, that it does ſtate "that I did produce to, and leave with, Mr. Temple "ſeveral letters to my brother from Gover-"nor Hutchinſon, Mr. Oliver, and others of "my brother's correſpondents in America." That is a truth. The other circumſtances, to which Mr. Temple objected, are, ſtrictly ſpeaking, liable to ſuch objections; but I aver that I never did acknowledge that the ſtate of facts relative to Mr. Temple in that paper are all falſe, except his having from me ſome letters of his own, and our having read together ſome other letters from Gentlemen in America.

Lombard-ſtreet, WM. WHATELY.
9 *Dec.* 1773.

From the PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

Great George-ſtreet, 18 *Dec.* 1773.

WHEN the malice of my enemies, by falſely impeaching my character, had put me to the hazard of my life, I flattered myſelf it would have reſted ſilent and ſatisfied: But as I underſtand they are ſtill buſy with my reputation, and are endeavouring

vouring by a thouſand miſrepreſentations to deſtroy that good name, which to me is ineſtimable, I am compelled to trouble the public with a detail of thoſe circumſtances which obliged me to appeal to the ſword. I hope to ſhew that my conduct in ſo doing was proper, as far as complying with a cuſtom, the tyranny of which, I confeſs, I have not fortitude to reſiſt, can be juſtified.

It is with infinite regret I find myſelf obliged to mention Mr. Whately, and that ſometimes in terms of cenſure. The part he took in the queſtion made me feel myſelf aggrieved by him. He anſwered me in the field like a man of ſpirit and a gentleman. It is with pleaſure I do this juſtice to his character.

When Mr. Whately was apprized of ſome original letters from Gentlemen in America to his late brother, having been ſent over, and made public at Boſton, he called upon me, read part of a letter from Mr. Oliver, complaining of the publication of his letters, and mentioned that he had given me acceſs to ſome of his brother's letters from his correſpondents in America. He accompanied this with a declaration, that he had not the leaſt ſuſpicion of me, and did not know that thoſe publiſhed letters were ever in his poſſeſſion; but he wiſhed I would authoriſe him to ſay I had them not

not from him. I gave Mr. Whately every aſſurance that a Gentleman could give, that I had not taken any one letter, nor a line of one, from among thoſe he ſhewed to me, but ſuch as he ſaw and gave me leave to take, and which were all written by my brother and myſelf. I did this repeatedly, and in the moſt explicit terms. Mr. Whately appeared perfectly ſatisfied; and I own, I did not expect he would have mentioned that tranſaction again in any manner that could throw a poſſibility of ſuſpicion on my character. For in my apprehenſion, when a Gentleman has pledged his honour to another, to inſinuate, or countenance a ſuſpicion of him afterwards, leads inevitably to the conſequences which have attended this tranſaction. Some time after this explanation between Mr. Whately and myſelf, ſeveral paragraphs appeared in the Newspapers highly injurious and diſhonourable to me. I was held forth as a monſter of ingratitude, and as a villain, who, under the cover of friendſhip, watched for an opportunity when Mr. Whately's back was turned, to rob him of papers which were in confidence put into my hands. Of theſe things I took no public notice, not becauſe they gave me no uneaſineſs, but becauſe I knew not how to redreſs myſelf. A ſearch after the authors of them I conceived would be

be vain. Such malevolent attacks could have been made by none but cowards, who would take care to conceal themſelves. It ſeemed impoſſible that Mr. Whately could have had any knowledge of the authors, or could have given any countenance to ſuch aſperſions, after the ſolemn aſſurances which I had given him; nor ſhould I have troubled him on the ſubject if his name had not been uſed as an authority to ſupport theſe falſe and malicious aſſertions. Theſe writers artfully ſuppreſſed three very material circumſtances in their repreſentations; that Mr. Whately did not know the letters ſent to Boſton were ever in his poſſeſſion; that of thoſe which he put into my hands none appeared to be miſſing, which could not have been the caſe if ſeventeen letters, and ſome of them very long, had been taken away; and that I had given him every aſſurance, which a Gentleman could require or receive, that no ſuch letters had been taken by me. Without the uſe of Mr. Whately's name, the charge would have had no effect upon the public. That Gentleman ſuffered the unfair and injurious repreſentations, under the ſanction of his name, to paſs unexplained. I did expect when he ſaw the purpoſe to which the men who gained intelligence from him were applying it, that he would in juſtice to truth,

truth, and to me, have ſtated the whole as above. If he had done ſo, I appeal to the judgment of the public, whether any ſuſpicion would have reſted upon me, or any ſerious conſequences followed. I did not aſk this of him, becauſe I thought he ought to have done it unaſked. There is an indelicacy in urging a Gentleman to do that which is his duty, and owes its merit to its being voluntary. The ſuſpicion againſt me upon ſo unfair a ſtate of facts, aided, I ſuppoſe, by the private ſlanders of thoſe who raiſed it, ſecretly gained ground; and on the 8th of this month a writer, under the ſignature of ANTENOR, renewed the accuſation of me by name, vouching it with a converſation which he ſeems to have himſelf held upon the ſubject with Mr. Whately.

Under ſo direct a charge, I thought it would not become me to be any longer ſilent. I went with the paper to Mr. Whately, and received from him, as I imagined, a ſatisfactory denial of thoſe pretended facts which materially ſupported the ſuſpicion. This I made public: Mr. Whately then came forward with his name. He omitted to ſtate what was ſolely eſſential, that he did not know the letters in queſtion were among thoſe he put into my hands, and that none of thoſe with which he had

had entruſted me appeared to be miſſing, but related the matter in ſuch a manner as ſtrongly to corroborate the anonymous charge, and gave me, to my underſtanding, the lie direct. They who have any feelings of honour will not wonder that I was impatient under ſuch an imputation, and thought every moment miſerable till I had called upon him, from whom I received ſuch an affront, for honourable amends. The Public is acquainted with the ſequel: But the circumſtances of that affair have been ſo falſely repreſented to my diſhonour, that I am obliged to beg a moment's indulgence till I ſtate that tranſaction fairly.

The Gentleman who waited upon Mr. Whately with my invitation, told him he would attend me as a ſecond if Mr. Whately would have one on his part. Mr. Whately declined having any ſecond, and therefore I brought none. He appeared at the place appointed with a ſword only. I gave him one of my piſtols. We diſcharged them mutually; mine being, at his requeſt, the firſt, without effect. If his was not directed at me, it eſcaped my obſervation. I then drew my ſword, and approached him, who had alſo unſheathed his, with a perſuaſion, grounded on his coming with a ſword only, when the choice of weapons was in him; that I was to encounter an adverſary much

ſuperiour

ſuperiour to myſelf in ſkill. I ſoon found my miſtake; and, as far as I could reaſon in ſuch a ſituation, determined, by wounding him in the ſword arm, to end the buſineſs without a fatal ſtroke. But my ſkill was not equal to my intention; it ſoon became a ſtruggle, inſtead of a regular combat, and I could only avoid making a full lunge, which probably would have wounded him mortally. The contortions of my antagoniſt's body, during the ſtruggle, expoſed parts, which in a regular encounter could never have been touched. When he turned himſelf to ſeize the blade of my ſword with his left-hand, I ſuppoſed he received the wounds in his left-ſide; and in ſome violent effort his ſhoulder muſt have been expoſed. The extreme ſmallneſs of the wound in that part being, as I am well informed, a mere puncture, proves it to have been accidental. Had my purpoſe been unfair, I ſhould have taken the life that was in my power; had it been mortal, every wound would not have been ſuperficial, and one only dangerous, not from its depth, but its direction. I underſtand it has been ſaid he was down. In ſuch circumſtances it is as impoſſible to account for every thing that happens, as to remember every thing that paſſes. But of this I am very ſure, that though he ſlipt once, he never fell.

It

It is proper to apprize the reader, that I am unfortunately very deaf. If any words of accommodation, as has been repreſented, were really uſed by Mr. Whately, I did not hear them. They who expect coolneſs in the midſt of ſuch a conflict, and deliberation in the moment of a deadly point being at one's breaſt, require too much. It is well that the paſſion, which riſes faſt on ſuch an occaſion, did not alter imperceptibly my general determination not to puſh ſo forcibly as to make a deep wound. It is with confidence I can affirm, I was not guilty of any unfair action, becauſe I never had an unfair thought—nor of a cruel one, becauſe my purpoſe was the reverſe.

I have received no bodily wound; but they whoſe minds can feel for conſequences, which they could not with honour avoid, will underſtand me when I ſay, that I have felt thoſe wounds which far ſurpaſs in anguiſh every bodily pain.

The anonymous aſſaſſins, who have been really the cauſe of this miſchief, remain unknown; but time, I truſt, will drag them forth to the puniſhment they deſerve.

Of thoſe to whom I am unknown, the candid and honourable are, I hope, convinced, that the injurious charges which have been brought againſt me are totally

without foundation—With thoſe to whom I am known, I flatter myſelf the conſtant tenour of my life has rendered a defence of my conduct unneceſſary.

I have but a few words more to ſay upon the ſubject.—As Mr. Whately's narrative tends to confirm the ſuſpicion of my having taken from him the letters which were ſent to Boſton, I do again moſt ſolemnly affirm, that I neither took from him thoſe, nor any other letters, but ſuch as were written by my brother and myſelf to the late Mr. Whately, and that with his knowledge and conſent; nor had I any concern, directly or indirectly, in procuring or tranſmitting the letters which were ſent to Boſton.

J. TEMPLE.

To the Printer of the Public Advertiſer.

SIR,

FINDING that two gentlemen have been unfortunately engaged in a duel about a tranſaction, and its circumſtances, of which both of them are totally ignorant and innocent, I think it incumbent on me to declare, (for the prevention of farther miſchief, as far as ſuch a declaration may contribute to prevent it,) that I alone am the perſon who obtained

and

and tranſmitted to Boſton the letters in queſtion. Mr. W. could not communicate them, becauſe they were never in his poſſeſſion; and, for the ſame reaſon, they could not be taken from him by Mr. T. They were not of the nature of *private letters between friends*: they were written by public officers to perſons in public ſtations, on public affairs, and intended to procure public meaſures; they were therefore handed to other public perſons who might be influenced by them to produce thoſe meaſures: their tendency was to incenſe the Mother Country againſt her Colonies, and, by the ſteps recommended, to widen the breach, which they effected. The chief caution expreſſed with regard to privacy was, to keep their contents from the Colony Agents, who the writers apprehended might return them, or copies of them, to America. That apprehenſion was, it ſeems, well founded; for the firſt Agent who laid his hands on them thought it his duty to tranſmit them to his conſtituents.

B. FRANKLIN, *Agent for the Houſe of Repreſentatives of the Maſſachuſets-Bay.*

Craven-ſtreet, Dec. 25, 1773.

From

From the PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

Cheam, 7th *January*, 1774.

IT is with great reluctance on my part that I am again called forth into print by Mr. Temple; but the letters I now lay before the Public, render it impoſſible for me to remain ſilent. The following letter from Mr. Temple to me of the 28th of December was tranſmitted to me at this place the day following:

SIR,

THERE are ſome moſt villanous reports propagated againſt me. Your confinement, I ſuppoſe, muſt have prevented their reaching your ears. It is ſaid that you fell upon the ground, and when in that ſituation, unable to defend yourſelf, that I ſtabbed you in the back, and in ſeveral other parts of your body. Theſe ſtories you know to be falſe: You therefore are the proper perſon to remove the impreſſions which they have made on the Public. I aſk no favour of you: my conduct requires none. The ſtate of your health has hitherto prevented my making any application to you. As I am informed by your ſurgeon that you are now much better, I can no longer, in juſtice to myſelf, poſtpone it. What I have to deſire of you is, that you

will inform the Public whether I did or did not in every reſpect behave to you like a Gentleman, and a man of honour.

I am, Sir,

Your moſt humble ſervant,

Great George-ſtreet, J. TEMPLE.

28th *Dec.* 1773.

To WILLIAM WHATELY, Eſq.

I deſired my brother to return the following anſwer before I had ſeen Mr. Temple's publication, dated the 18th, but given to the Public the 30th of December.

SIR, *December 29th*, 1773.

MY brother this day received your letter of the 28th December, in which you require him to inform the Public whether you did or did not in every reſpect behave to him like a Gentleman, and a man of honour. If on a cooler conſideration you ſhould inform me that you ſtill perſiſt in your deſire, and mean to compel him to lay the affair before the Public, I am to aſſure you, that as ſoon as his health is ſufficiently re-eſtabliſhed, he cannot on his own account have any objection. At preſent he is at his ſurgeon's houſe in the country, and in too weak a ſtate to attend to this, or any other buſineſs.

I am, your moſt humble ſervant,

JOSEPH WHATELY.

P. S.

P. S. A letter may probably come to my hand the ſooner for being directed to me at my brother's in Lombard-ſtreet.

Mr. Temple's anſwer to my brother was as follows:

SIR, *Great George-ſtreet, 31ſt Dec.* 1773.

I REQUIRED that juſtice from your brother which one Gentleman has a right to expect from another. You have anſwered me with an inſulting letter. Had your brother, when he ſaw my character attacked by a ſet of anonymous aſſaſſins, under the ſanction of his name, ſtated to the Public the whole truth concerning me, neither my reputation would have ſuffered, nor ſhould we have been forced into a perſonal conteſt. If he chooſes to purſue the ſame conduct relative to the new falſehoods which have been with the moſt wicked induſtry circulated to my diſhonour, the cenſure of it muſt reſt upon him. As to compelling him to a publication, it is my wiſh that he ſhould be under no compulſion, but that of a true ſenſe of what is juſt and honourable. You ſpeak of cooler conſideration on what I have requeſted. Sir, upon the cooleſt conſideration I repeat, that I aſk no favour of him. I expected juſtice: He has denied it, conſcious of my innocence. I therefore now ſet him at defiance, and am ready to meet his appeal to the Public whenever he

pleaſes, firmly relying upon that juſtice from them which he has thought proper to deny.

I am, Sir, Your moſt humble ſervant,

J. TEMPLE.

Your letter was not left at my houſe till late laſt night, or it ſhould have been ſooner anſwered.

This letter makes it a matter of neceſſity with me minutely to relate the whole tranſaction.

It was about one o'clock on Saturday the 11th of December, that Mr. Izard called upon me in Lombard-ſtreet, and informed me that he waited on me on a very diſagreeable affair relating to his friend Mr. Temple. He then produced the Newspaper containing my publication, and pointing out theſe words "that is a truth," informed me that that aſſertion was the part to which Mr. Temple objected and denied, and which he inſiſted on my retracting. I think I need ſcarce add that this was refuſed on my part; upon which Mr. Izard delivered me the letter containing Mr. Temple's challenge, and appointing the meeting to be at four o'clock that afternoon at the Ring in Hyde-Park. Upon my giving my anſwer into Mr. Izard's hands, he aſked if I propoſed having any friend to accompany me; and on my informing him I never choſe to involve

others

others in my own difficulties, we parted. I cannot help obſerving in this place, and whoever refers to the words of my former publication muſt agree with me, that I deemed myſelf called forth by Mr. Temple not for any repreſentation given by me of our laſt converſation, but for an aſſertion originally and freely made by me from the beginning, and invariably continued, and which contained a fact I muſt neceſſarily (viewing the affair in any light) moſt ſincerely wiſh had never happened, and which therefore nothing but a ſenſe of truth could have induced me to declare. Unſkilled, and altogether unpractiſed, as I make no ſcruple to declare myſelf in the uſe of arms, and the ſhortneſs of the time not admitting of any purpoſed preparation, I provided myſelf with the only weapon I had at hand, which is the reaſon, and the only reaſon, that I appeared on the ſpot with the ſword only. Upon Mr. Temple's expreſſing himſelf that he preſumed I had piſtols about me, I told him I had not: but that if he was provided with fire arms, I was willing to ſhare his arms with him; and upon his fixing upon the ſpot, he delivered to me one of his piſtols, and bid me take my diſtance. I retired a ſmall ſpace, and deſired to receive his fire, which he gave me without effect. I then pointed my piſtol in a line with my antagoniſt's

antagoniſt's body, but purpoſely raiſed conſiderably above his head. Mr. Temple then drew his ſword; I did the ſame. He ſoon took occaſion to obſerve to me, that he perceived I was no ſwordſman, which I readily confeſſed. Early in the conteſt he ſeized my ſword with his left hand, and bid me aſk my life. I peremptorily refuſed, and a ſlight effort diſengaged us. I very ſoon had him at the ſame advantage. I had his ſword ſecured in my left hand, and my own ſword at liberty; when I bid him not to aſk his life, but to take it unaſked. We were again diſengaged, and ſoon I once more availed myſelf of another opportunity to ſeize his ſword, and again I bid him take his life unaſked. He proceeded on each of theſe occaſions as not hearing me, at leaſt he made no reply. I am far from unwilling to make allowance for the infirmity of my opponent. After this I made no further effort to ſeize his ſword, but continued to act on the defenſive only, though on ſeveral occaſions many parts of his body appeared to my judgment to be unguarded, and, with ſecurity to myſelf, open to my attack. My conduct was ſo obviouſly defenſive, that it was even noticed by Mr. Temple, to whom I made no other reply, than that I ſhould defend my life. The conteſt continued; the countenance of my antagoniſt ſtill ſometimes bearing

bearing ſtrongly the marks of paſſion and rage. It was, I preſume, under ſome ſuch unhappy, ungovernable influence, that late in the affair, and not long before we were parted, he declared he would put me to death. But in this part of my narrative let me add, that he never appeared to me to make any long lunge at me. One or two horſemen and ſome perſons on foot were ſoon afterwards at no great diſtance, and making up to us, and my foot, in retreating, happening to ſlip, I fell firſt on my ſword hand, and then on my left hand; and before I could recover myſelf, ſeveral perſons were near to us. Mr. Temple ſtepped up to me, and ſaid we ſhould meet again, and even propoſed then to withdraw. I do not recollect that I returned any anſwer; in a little time Mr. Izard came up to us, and now finding my loſs of blood was conſiderable, and that my breaſt was affected in a manner that made me draw my breath with difficulty, I accepted Mr. Izard's offer to take his coach, which was then in the Park, and near at hand, to convey me to Mr. Sanxay's, or Mr. Davenport's, my ſurgeons. In our way to Eſſex-ſtreet on my mentioning to Mr. Izard ſome circumſtances of the affair, and particularly my having twice hold of my adverſary's ſword, and the uſe I made of thoſe ſituations, he ſuggeſted that it would be

be better to ſay nothing of the duel, alledging that Mr. Temple was a man of that violence of temper, that if any miſrepreſentations were to get abroad, which is always, more or leſs, the caſe, it might induce him to renew it. The only anſwer I could make, and the only anſwer I did make, was, that I had neither a motive or wiſh to conceal the duel. Mr. Izard ſtayed, and was preſent with me at Mr. Davenport's, during the greateſt part of the time employed in dreſſing my wounds; and I took opportunities to declare that I did not pretend to be a judge of the points, which, in the eye of the world, conſtitute fair or unfair fighting, and therefore did not take upon me to accuſe Mr. Temple of unfair proceeding, meaning by a declaration thus couched, to reſerve to myſelf my own ſentiments. Mr. Temple has called for thoſe ſentiments, and I mean they ſhould be intelligibly conveyed in the narrative I have given, and the evidence accompanying it, with reſpect to ſuch of my wounds as are ſingular, particularly one on my left ſide, a little above my hip, which I underſtand muſt have been in conſequence, not of an oblique but of a direct thruſt, tending to the center of the body, and one on the back part of my left ſhoulder. I declare, I know not when I received theſe hurts; I neither ſaw nor felt the ſword at

the time they were given: I muſt therefore lay it before the Public, and appeal to the teſtimony of others, who happened to be eye-witneſſes, or can give information of the tranſaction, and to the declaration of Mr. Davenport, who firſt dreſſed my wounds.

BEING called upon to declare the number and ſituation of the wounds which Mr. Whately received in a late duel, I do declare that there were five only which demanded the attention of a ſurgeon, or required dreſſings.

Three of theſe were in the front of the body, viz. one on the inferiour part of the right breaſt, one a little below the collar-bone of the left ſide, the third on the pit of the ſtomach; this laſt only was important.

With regard to the other two wounds, one was ſituated rather below the middle of the left ſide of the body; the other behind, about the center of the left ſhoulder blade.

Eſſex-ſtreet, R. DAVENPORT.
Jan. 2*d*, 1774.

I have treſpaſſed much on the reader's patience. I have only to add, that as all ſort of intercourſe (whether hoſtile or amicable) between Mr. Temple and myſelf, is at an end for the remainder of our lives, I hope

I hope and I truſt, I ſhall never again have occaſion to addreſs the Public relative to this untoward event.

WILLIAM WHATELY.

From the PUBLIC ADVERTISER.

IT is my duty to declare to the Public, that Mr. Whately has miſtaken my words. I have been acquainted with Mr. Temple many years, and never thought his temper violent; I therefore could never have ſaid that it was. I have always thought him a perſon of the ſtricteſt honour, and poſſeſſed of ſuch proper ſpirit, as to chaſtiſe any man who ſhould preſume to countenance the ſuſpicion of it. Mr. Whately told me, that he received Mr. Temple's fire, and then diſcharged his piſtol in the air; that Mr. Temple diſarmed him, and deſired him to aſk his life, which he refuſed to do; that he then diſarmed Mr. Temple, and told him to take his life unaſked. I thought there was an impropriety in Mr. Temple's drawing his ſword, after Mr. Whately had diſcharged the piſtol in the air; and in his renewing the fight, after having diſarmed his antagoniſt. I therefore deſired Mr. Whately to be cautious of propagating circumſtances

cumſtances which might tend to throw any diſhonour on my friend, as I was apprehenſive it might be the means of compelling him a ſecond time to call him to account. Mr. Temple has ſtated the whole tranſaction to the Public in ſo full and ſatisfactory a manner, that I hope he will give himſelf no more trouble about it. Conſcious of the honourable part which he acted through the whole of this buſineſs, he has deſpiſed the reports which have been circulated. I confeſs they alarmed me; eſpecially when I was informed that they were to be ſupported by affidavits. I had too good an opinion of Mr. Temple, to give the leaſt credit to any injurious reports; but if two men had ſworn that they ſaw him *ſtabbing Mr. Whately in the back, and in ſeveral other parts of his body, when he was fallen on the ground, and unable to defend himſelf*, (which were the reports circulated againſt Mr. Temple,) I fear that he would have borne through life, a character very different from the one he deſerves. The trifling and ridiculous declarations, about *a fat large Gentleman, and a lean one*, have totally removed my fears. One of the declarations I know to be falſe: If therefore the reſt contained any thing material againſt Mr. Temple, which is very far from being the caſe, the Public would judge what credit ought to be given

to

to them. I was at the diſtance of about three hundred yards from my coach at the time the piſtols were diſcharged. The teſtimony of my ſervants will not, I truſt, be thought neceſſary to ſupport this circumſtance. As Mr. Whately ſpeaks of *having loſt much blood* and of *his breaſt being affected in a manner that made him draw his breath with difficulty*, it may be imagined that he knew himſelf to be much wounded at the time I offered him the uſe of my coach. I declare, upon my honour, that I then aſked him if he was wounded, and his anſwer was, he had a ſcratch on his face, and as there was ſome blood on the ſide of his ſhirt, he knew that he was wounded; but thought the hurt very trifling, as he felt no pain. This he repeated to me ſeveral times in the coach, but never gave me the moſt diſtant hint of his having fallen, or of receiving any unfair treatment from Mr. Temple. The unuſual exerciſe which he had juſt been engaged in might probably have occaſioned a ſhortneſs of breath.

When Mr. Whately was ſtripped at the ſurgeon's, and ſaw his wounds, he thought them of ſuch little conſequence, that he ſeemed only deſirous of concealing the ſcratch on his face from his mother, in whoſe company, he ſaid, he expected ſoon to be—I think that night. He ſpoke in perfect

fect good humour of Mr. Temple, hoped that he was not wounded, and desired that I would let him know whether he was or not. I told him that if Mr. Temple was wounded, I would inform him of it as soon as I went home; and if he did not hear from me that night, he might conclude Mr. Temple was not hurt. Mr. Whately was not satisfied with this, but desired me to write to him, and inform him whether Mr. Temple was wounded or not. When I arrived at my own house, I found Mr. Temple there, and had the satisfaction of hearing from him, that the only hurt he received, was a slight scratch in the hand. I immediately wrote to Mr. Whately; but as I thought the affair entirely at an end, I did not keep a copy of my letter. The following is the answer I received.

DEAR SIR, 11*th Dec. Evening.*

IT is with satisfaction I learn that Mr. Temple has received no hurt, and am obliged to both of you for your anxiety on my account. *I do not imagine there can be the least room for any apprehensions from the trifling hurts I received.*

I am, dear Sir,
Your most humble servant,
WM. WHATELY.

(Directed to Ralph Izard, *Esq.)*

I think it right to lay these facts before the

the Public, that they may form what judgment they think proper.

Berner's-ſtreet, Jan. 8, 1774. R. IZARD.

From the Same.

IT was not till I had ſeen Mr. Whately's laſt publication, that I could prevail on myſelf to think him any other at heart than an honeſt, well-meaning, though a weak man, under very bad influence. That publication has fully ſettled the matter in my mind. Having, with a ſacred regard to truth and candour, already ſubmitted to the Public a circumſtantial account of the late affair between Mr. Whately and myſelf, it would be only an unneceſſary repetition to point out the miſrepreſentations in his account of that affair. I ſhall only obſerve, that Mr. Whately might have ſpared himſelf the trouble of writing the laſt paragraph of his narrative; as it always has been, and ſtill continues to be my determination, to have as little concern and intercourſe as poſſible with any but men of truth and honour. His friendſhip and enmity I hold in equal contempt.

Great George-ſtreet, Jan. 9. J. TEMPLE.

From

From the PUBLIC ADVERTISER, *of* February 10, 1774.

To ALEXANDER WEDDERBURNE, *Eſq.*

YOU ſtated as a fact, in your late ſpeech before the Privy Council, that Dr. Franklin ſent the letters in an anonymous cover, with injunctions of ſecrecy, written in a hand, however, well known there; not to the Speaker, as officially he ought to have done, but to private perſons. From hence you draw a concluſion, that he was conſcious of villany, and aſhamed of having it known.

The weakneſs of this ſtating, were it true, would defeat the wickedneſs of the concluſion. How could you ſuppoſe a man would expect concealment from ſuppreſſing his name, if his hand were well known; or if, by ſome ſtrange confuſion of ideas, he did think himſelf concealed, to what end ſhould he enjoin ſecrecy? Wherefore ſhould he have wiſhed for concealment? Was there ſuch terror in the hatred of thoſe he detected, Mr. Hutchinſon and Mr. Oliver? Could he poſſibly have conceived that any ſet of Miniſters would be ſo weak and wicked

as

as to perſecute him for a meaſure, which miniſtered to them the faireſt opportunity of healing graciouſly thoſe unhappy diviſions with which they were perplexed in the extreme?

But what will your hearers, what will the world think of you, when I affirm, that the whole of what you ſtated was an abſolute falſehood? I defy you to prove a word of it. I feel the harſhneſs of the terms I uſe, but I appeal to every one who heard you, whether the language you uttered intitles you to be treated like a gentleman?

The letters were incloſed to the Speaker; that which accompanied them was ſigned by the Agent; nor was there a ſingle injunction of ſecrecy with regard to the ſender. He apprehended that the immediate publication of them would raiſe the popular indignation ſo as to be fatal to the writers. Out of humanity to them he deſired they might not be made public.

Dr. Franklin's declaration was the next ſubject of your abuſe. You enveighed againſt it as marking the moſt inhuman apathy that the imagination could conceive, made to inſult over the diſtreſs, and aggravate the wounds which his villany had occaſioned.

Let us ſtate the fact, and ſee how far it will ſupport the charge.

On

On the 8th of December a letter, under the ſignature of *Antenor*, accuſed Mr. Temple of diſhonourably taking the letters in queſtion from Mr. Whately, whoſe name was vouched for the truth of the charge. The next day Mr. Temple's accuſer appeared, declaring Mr. Whately's concurrence with him in denying the facts on which the charge was founded. So far was there in this ſtage of the buſineſs an appearance of any quarrel likely to happen between theſe two Gentlemen, it ſeemed as if they were united in contradicting a malignant, anonymous accuſation: But on the 11th Mr. Whately contradicted Mr. Temple, and at four o'clock that day the duel was fought. What time or opportunity was there here for the intervention of Dr. Franklin, eſpecially as Mr. Temple's challenge was grounded on the other's flatly denying what he had given to the Public under his hand? The original cauſe too of the diſpute was, Mr. Whately's having given riſe to and countenanced a moſt falſe, unjuſt, and cruel accuſation againſt Mr. Temple.

DUEL *between Lord* GEORGE GERMAIN, *and Governour* JOHNSTONE.

ON the fourteenth of December, 1770, Lord George Germain made a motion in the Houſe of Commons for a better attendance of the Members; and ſaid, that what he had been urging was for the honour of the nation, in which he declared he greatly intereſted himſelf. Governour Johnſtone, in reply, ſaid, that he was ſurpriſed the Noble Lord ſhould intereſt himſelf in the honour of his country, after he had been ſo regardleſs of his own. Lord George did not hear the words ſpoken by Governour Johnſtone, being gone out of the Houſe, but he was informed of them by his friends; he was ſorry, he ſaid, that he had miſſed the opportunity of making an inſtant replication; but that, however, he would take proper notice of it.

On Monday the 17th of December, 1770, Governour Johnſtone was attending the Committee, who were ſitting on the petitions relative to the embankment at Durham-yard, when Mr. Thomas Townſhend, (now Lord Sidney,) came to him, and deſiring to ſpeak with him, took him into another room,

room, where he told him, after making a very polite and gentleman-like excuſe, as to what ſhare he had in the buſineſs he came upon, that the reflection he had caſt on the character of Lord George Germain, though not heard by himſelf at the time, had been communicated to him by his friends; and that in conſequence, Lord George had begged of him to wait on Governour Johnſtone, to deſire he would retract what he had ſaid; that, for his own part, he ſhould be exceedingly ſorry to have a quarrel happen between two Gentlemen whom he knew, and for whom he had a great reſpect, and therefore hoped, to prevent the conſequences, Governour Johnſtone would retract what he had ſaid reſpecting Lord George. The Governour ſaid it was very true, he had made uſe of ſuch and ſuch expreſſions in the Houſe; that they conveyed his opinion; and that he would maintain and ſupport it. Upon which Mr. Townſhend ſaid, in that caſe, Lord George demanded the ſatisfaction of a Gentleman from him; which the other declared he was ready to give his Lordſhip at any time. Mr. Townſhend then ſaid, Lord George was in an adjoining room, and if the Governour pleaſed they would go to him. The Governour aſſented; and Mr. Townſhend conveyed him to the room in

which Lord George was waiting. Lord George repeated the cauſe of quarrel, and the demand of ſatisfaction, which the other acquieſced in; and deſired his Lordſhip would appoint his own time and place. Lord George then mentioned the Ring in Hyde-Park; and, as in affairs of this kind, all times were alike, the preſent was, in his opinion, as good a one as any. Governour Johnſtone entirely agreed with Lord George as to the place; but ſaid, that as he was now attending his duty in a Committee, on a ſubject he had very much at heart, he hoped the meeting Lord George an hour hence would make no difference. Lord George ſaid, no; and then ſpoke as to ſeconds, informing the Governour at the ſame time, that he had deſired Mr. Townſhend to attend him in that light. Governour Johnſtone ſaid, there was little occaſion for ſeconds, and that therefore Mr. Townſhend ſhould ſtand in that light as to both of them. Governour Johnſtone further ſaid, that as he had at that time an open wound in his arm, and his legs very much ſwelled, he could wiſh they would uſe piſtols; to which Lord George ſaying it was equal to him what the weapons were, they ſeparated; and Governour Johnſtone returned to the Committee. In this conference, as well as through the whole affair, both the

Gentlemen behaved with the greateſt politeneſs to each other, as well as with the greateſt courage. At the appointed hour, Lord George, and Mr. Townſhend were in the Ring, and ſoon after Governour Johnſtone, accompanied by Sir James Lowther, (now Lord Lonſdale,) arrived, whom he had happened to meet in his way, and had ſolicited to go with him. Lord George accoſted Governour Johnſtone, and deſired he would mention the diſtance, declaring he was then upon his ground, and the Governour might take what diſtance he pleaſed. The Governour was taken back by the ſeconds, about twenty ſmall paces. The antagoniſts having prepared their piſtols, Lord George called on the Governour to fire, which the Governour refuſed, ſaying, that as his Lordſhip brought him there, he muſt fire firſt. Upon which Lord George fired, and then the Governour; neither of the ſhots took effect. Lord George then fired his ſecond piſtol, and as he was taking down his arm the Governour's ſecond ball hit his Lordſhip's piſtol, broke ſome part of it, and one of the ſplinters grazed his Lordſhip's hand. The ſeconds immediately interpoſed, and the affair was ended.

Governour Johnſtone, afterwards declared to his friends, that in all the affairs of this kind

kind which he ever knew, or was concerned in, he never found a man behave with more courage and coolneſs than Lord George did on this occaſion.

MANAGEMENT *of the* LONDON GAZETTE.

[*By Meſſieurs* BURKES.]

Thurſday, June 9, 1776.

AS all men have their virtues a little balanced by ſome failings, it is ſurely a good-natured part not to dwell upon the qualities they are deficient in, but rather to fix our attention on thoſe points of their character, in which they evidently excel. I ſhould think it the crueleſt thing in the world to dwell upon Lord George Germain's conduct of the civil war; but I am happy to join with the world in applauding his Lordſhip's dexterous management of the Gazette.

Whilſt under his auſpices, and animated by his example, our commanders, by happily *ſhifting* of their poſition, by taking the reſolution of *evacuating* towns, and by effecting *retreats* without loſs, are (though quite in a new way) conquering Provinces abroad; his Lordſhip is employed, according

to

to the ſoundeſt principles of the beſt critics, in recording their great exploits at home.

Livy has been cenſured as diffuſe; Salluſt, Thucydides, and Tacitus, have been criticiſed for an affected brevity, bordering on the obſcure. Theſe general remarks favour of pedantry, and mere literary cant. To judge of the faults or excellence of the diffuſe, or the conciſe, of the perſpicuous, or the obſcure ſtyles, we muſt conſider well the nature of the ſubject, and the deſign of the author. No univerſal rule can be laid down. Some things cannot be diſplayed too amply, and too minutely to the public curioſity. Others had better be juſt touched upon. Some ſhould ſhine in a glare of light; others ſhould be caſt modeſtly into the ſhade. Some ought to be proclaimed by the ſound of trumpet; others there are, in which ſilence is the real eloquence.

If you would know how well Lord George Germain has employed all theſe ſtyles (and this no ſtyle) you muſt conſider the end and purpoſe for which (beſides fame and immortality) a Secretary of State condeſcends to become an author.

The world at large is not aware of the real object of our war in America. The ſole drift and end of all our operations there, has hitherto been, neither more nor leſs, than to diſpoſe of the ſums of money that have

have been raiſed here. Theſe have been vaſt; and the diſperſion of them has not been ſo perfectly eaſy, as the common run of people might imagine. But, by the aid of our kind and diſintereſted friends, (the London contractors, and the German Princes,) the thing may be done. The facility, however, of the expenditure, may not always facilitate the ſupply. A great Stateſman, like other ingenious artiſts, muſt tickle the ear, whilſt he extracts the purſe. The mob out of doors love a little good news, though it be at their own coſt. A victory is worth a million; and a good bonfire compenſates a tax. The wiſe Miniſter (like the induſtrious ant) forecaſts the winter, and prepares the mind for the ways and means of the ſeſſion, by the intelligence with which he entertains us during the receſs. In the execution of this plan, he ſtrictly follows the great maſters of antiquity.

The polite critic of the Court of Auguſtus, Horace, was intended by that great Emperor (not ſo happy in obtaining obedience to his commands as our Sovereign) for the office of Secretary of State. Whilſt that buſineſs was in agitation, he wrote thoſe excellent rules for Gazettes, which have been unaccountably miſtaken for the rules of dramatic poetry. A groſs error! for what has a Secretary of State to do with *writing* tragedies?

tragedies? Or how can we imagine that Horace, after commanding a Roman legion, and diſtinguiſhing himſelf in war, ſhould condeſcend to undertake the direction of the opera? The Gazette is the proper buſineſs of his department. Beſides the obſervations on ſtyle that I have juſt made, and which I confeſs I borrowed from this great judge, he makes ſeveral others of moment. He adviſes his Gazette writer to mix his falſehood with ſome truth, *ita mentitur* (ſays he) *ut veris falſa remiſcet.* And he gives his reaſon, and a very ſolid one,

Primo ne medium, medio ne diſcrepat imum.

He recommends it to them to put off, and to bring on matters, as may beſt ſuit political purpoſes:

Ut nunc dicat jam nunc debentia dici,
Pleraque differat, et preſens in tempus omittat.

But if facts prove ſo very untractable, as by no art of mixture or procraſtination, to be made pleaſant, why then he thinks they are to be totally omitted:

——————— *Que*
Deſperat tractata niteſcere poſſe, relinquit.

To exemplify in the moſt ſatisfactory manner his Lordſhip's ſkill in conducting his Gazette upon theſe rules, the reader may remember the ample account we had of the exploits

exploits of Lord Dunmore. No one captive piece was omitted of thoſe miſerable old cannon, which, until they were to "open their mouths, and ſhew forth his praiſe," had ſlept and ruſted in neglect on the wharfs of Virginia. All the pompous diſplay of Livy and Clarendon, were employed to decorate the triumph of this favourite General. After this great and deciſive advantage obtained by Lord Dunmore (as far as we could diſcover from the Gazette) we had nothing to do, but to take poſſeſſion of a diſarmed Province. The gratitude of the nation was equal to the ſervices of the General. His Lordſhip was immortalized in the Gazette. He was adopted into the ſacred ſixteen, levees, aſſemblies, coffee-houſes, all agreed (and they were certainly right) that if every Governor had acted with the ſpirit of Lord Dunmore, we muſt have eſtabliſhed our dominion in all the other Provinces, as perfectly as we had done in Virginia.

In the midſt of all the joy that aroſe from ſuch important victories as Lord Dunmore's, ſo amply diſplayed, an odd ſort of an account arrived. A very brave officer, as brave and as intelligent an officer as any in the King's ſervice, Major Fordyce, with a detachment of our beſt grenadiers, was ſent by this heroic commander Lord Dunmore, upon

upon a well-planned expedition, to which there were but two ſmall objections. One, that it was perfectly impracticable; the other, that if it did ſucceed, it could be of no kind of uſe. Accordingly Major Fordyce was killed. The party was defeated; all the grenadiers ſlain or made priſoners—What ſaid the lately communicative Gazette? Not a ſyllable. The Secretary of State had waſted his ſtock of eloquence in his panegyric on Lord Dunmore. He had nothing left for the funeral oration of Fordyce. He was as ſilent as the grave in which that gallant officer and his brave ſoldiers were laid. And where was the neceſſity for much diſcourſe? The man was dead; and what did it ſignify to put ourſelves into an ill humour about what we could not poſſibly help.

This Virginian hiſtory is an inſtance of the diffuſed ſtyle of the Gazette contraſted with the oppoſite extreme of excellence,—the expreſſive and eloquent ſilence. The inſtances of a leſs violent, but equally judicious contraſt, are frequent, and happily mixed in. I will endeavour to recal them to the reader's memory. Without ſuch a retroſpect it will not be eaſy to enter into the true ſpirit of this exquiſite politico-literary performance, which is now the ſole ſource of authentic intelligence, and the only vehicle of our ſummer's delight and information.

When the forts of St. John and Chamblé were taken by the Provincials, and upwards of 500 regular troops made priſoners, there was a demand for the compact, cloſe, laconic, ſtyle. The Gazette did not altogether omit theſe events; but with a wonderful energy and brevity, related them in much fewer lines than the ſhorteſt article of the capitulation, by which thoſe unhappy troops had ſurrendered priſoners of war. Of cannon and ſtores, not one word. Theſe were left to the imagination of the reader. All accounts of the taking of cannon, in the explicit ſtyle, belonged, excluſively, to Lord Dunmore.

We may remember too, that when Arnold made the aſtoniſhing march, which will for ever immortaliſe his name, the Gazette was not abſolutely ſilent. It gave to merit *one honeſt line*; and in the laconic brevity of Lord George Germain, "*one* Arnold appeared at Point Levi."

Of the taking of Montreal, which place with the whole ſtrength of England and America conjoined, had formerly given glory and Peerage to Lord Amherſt—on the part of the Gazette SILENCE;—Col. Preſcot, his ſhips, his ſoldiers, his ſtores taken afterwards—SILENCE.

This uniformity of ſilence, however prudent, and even chaſtely eloquent, might ſeem

ſeem rather dull, and at length begin to diſguſt. People might learn an ugly habit of looking elſewhere for intelligence. In this diſtreſs an event happened, which juſtified the drawing up the floodgate, and letting out all that flow of eloquence which had been ſo long dammed in. *Montgomery*, an obſcure man, of whom we had heard *nothing* before *from authority*, was killed at Quebec, and his troops repulſed. But unfortunately, even on this faireſt of all occaſions, we were again ſadly at a loſs. This happy opportunity was in danger of being wholly thrown away. The queſtion aroſe, where is the authority for this good news? The conquering General was too cloſely blocked up, to ſend a meſſenger of the deciſive victory he had obtained. To take intelligence from the Philadelphia newspapers, and to put at the foot of the account, "*Charles Thompſon*," (not our *Sir* Charles,) "and *by order of the Congreſs*," was too much. In effect, it was to regiſter a rebellious libel among the conſecrated records of office. This was hard undoubtedly.

The difficulty ſtaggered the American Secretary of State. In an hurry a council is called. The Attorney General, in his firm, ſturdy, direct way, objected to the meaſure. He relied on it, that ſuch a ſtep might teach people to put ſome truſt in rebellious

rebellious publications; and would, beſides, totally take away the beſt, and ſometimes only excuſe we had for our prudent reſerve on moſt of our defeats, viz. that we had them only from the narrative of the rebels. This had ſome weight. But Mr. Wedderburne, whoſe *forte* is dexterity and refinement, obſerved, that the Congreſs, as they are a raw, new government, and to that time unacquainted with diſgraces, had not learned the art of gloſſing a misfortune, but had delivered "a plain, round, unvarniſhed tale" of their defeat. This advantage is not to be miſſed. Here (ſaid Mr. Wedderburne) we may dilate at the expence of an enemy. The narrative, as far as it goes, is their own; and our imagination is at liberty to add full enough on this foundation. We cloath ourſelves with the ſpoils of the enemy. We may dreſs ourſelves "*à la Congreſs.*"

——— *Danaumq; inſignia nobis*
Aptemus, dolus an virtus quis in hoſte requirit?

Lord George carried it for his friend the Solicitor's opinion. The Philadelphia Congreſs Gazette ſupplied the materials for our's; and here, (but at their expence,) we expatiated again. The ſtunted Gazette once more ſhot out into a full luxuriance of narrative.

This

This mode, however, of borrowing an enemy's account is too tickliſh to be adopted as a regular practice. Then came in the great delicate point in all human affairs, "to know when to leave off." For, unluckily, thoſe exotic Congreſs news-papers began to ſhoot out ſome things that would not bear tranſplanting, and were not at all adapted to flouriſh in the ſoil of the London Gazette. The taking, for inſtance, of Brigadier General Macdonald in North Carolina—the killing Colonel Macleod—the defeat of 1500 of our Highland troops, and the diſarming of the whole party;—although all undeniably true—was not proper ſtuff for a London Gazette. The expedition of General Schuyler into the Indian country, although equally certain—the capitulation of Sir John Johnſon—the making him a priſoner on parole—the ſubmiſſion and laying down their arms by 600 of our loyal ſubjects (Scots and Tories) and the compelling ſome of our natural allies, the humane Savages of the Five Nations, to lay down the hatchet—theſe accounts, one ſees at firſt ſight, could by no art be made fitting for the Gazette. Of theſe, therefore, nothing was ſaid.

The end of writing is *et prodeſſe et delectare*. In a paper where the profit of Miniſters, and the delight of the people, were to be the great objects, it would be a piece of down-

right

right abſurdity to mention ſuch things as cannot poſſibly tell to the advantage of the one of the parties, or afford any ſort of ſatisfaction to either of them.

Mr. Miller, I find it impoſſible to do juſtice to the merits of Miniſters, as Hiſtorians of their own exploits, in a ſingle paper. The ſubject grows upon me, as the matter riſes in dignity and importance. Reſerving, therefore, the inimitable beauties of the Boſton narrative to another time, I ſhall for the preſent ſatisfy myſelf with remarking, that the naval part of the war, though probably it comes from another quarter, is related on the ſame principle, and with no leſs perfection than that, which is carried on upon the *Terra firma*.

One of our men of war returns home rather in a ſhabby condition. But what does ſhe come for? In reality to bring the news of her own eſcape from the Americans. Since our affairs are in that pleaſant ſituation, that retreats are *happy ſhiftings of poſition*, and, that eſcapes are to take rank as victories, it becomes neceſſary to diſplay this eminent advantage at full length; and it is accordingly related at large in the true technical ſtyle, and with all the elegant perſpicuity of the nautical dialect. The Gazette, ſo lately on the reſerve, here becomes prodigal of information. We have, on the eſcape

of

of the Glaſgow (for the firſt time) an account of Commodore Hopkins's ſquadron; the number of veſſels; the number of guns; the number of men; an account as exact as if we were furniſhed with it from the Navy Office of Philadelphia. The ſtate of the Britiſh Navy was refuſed on the motion of a Marine officer in Parliament, laſt ſeſſion. Amends are now made by a preciſe detail (given gratis) of one of the American fleets. We have the ſatisfaction to find that this navy is in ſhoal water, (but ſafe enough,) in New England. In the late war, the eſcape of one of our ſtout frigates, built and furniſhed for war, from a little ſquadron, conſiſting of a decayed merchantman, with a ſloop and ſchooner or two, haſtily and ill fitted into privateers, would ſcarce have deſerved a long laboured account in the Gazette. But things are altered; Mr. Pitt *was*, Lord George Germain *is*, Secretary of State.

In this laſt piece we are furniſhed at one and the ſame time with a curious example of the various excellencies of the full diſplay, and of the judicious reſerve. The Gazette, which knows ſo minutely every gun in Hopkins's fleet, and its weight of metal, ſays nothing at all of this fellow's carrying his convoy, and the military ſtores with which he was heavily laden, ſafely to the

place of their deſtination: Nor does it know, that he had taken a tranſport and tender in his Majeſty's ſervice. It even omits a piece of good fortune of the Glaſgow, whoſe ſhot in the very firſt broadſide damaged Hopkins's rudder in ſuch a manner, that his ſhip lay for two hours incapable of purſuit or fight.

To compleat this account of the American Regatta, made for our ſpecial amuſement; by the ſame uſe of light and ſhade in the narrative, we are informed that a great number of ſhips and *veſſels* have been taken. By this judicious choice of terms, the number is as effectually ſwelled by the ſeizure of a cock boat, as by the taking of the largeſt ſhip that ever ſailed in the Virginia trade.

As to captures made on the part of the Americans, we might conclude from the prudent ſilence of the Gazette, that there were abſolutely none. If it were not for an impertinent tell-tale in the city, called Lloyd's Liſt, (who, in all good policy ought to be ſilenced,) we ſhould never have gueſſed that above FIFTY tranſport ſhips had been taken by the Americans; the ſhips themſelves, excluſive of the cargoes, of as much value at leaſt as the whole of the prizes taken from the Americans.

In a word, whether by land or ſea, we are

are ſcarcely intitled from *authority* to believe, that one misfortune has happened in the whole war. All is glory, ſucceſs, and victory. Yet thirteen Provinces are loſt.

VALENS.

Account of the Duel between the Marquis Townſhend *and the Earl of* Bellamont.

ON the 24th of November, 1772, Lord Bellamont employed Lord Charlemont to wait on Lord Townſhend with the following paper, which he read to Lord Townſhend. It will fully explain the nature of the offence given to Lord Bellamont at the Caſtle of Dublin in February, 1770, and was as follows:

" I wait upon your Lordſhip by deſire of Lord Bellamont: Firſt, To return your Lordſhip his thanks for the recommendations to the King, with which you honoured him, and for which it was his intention to have thanked you in perſon, if you had done him the favour to receive him the laſt time that he attended by your Lordſhip's appointment for private audience. I am further to acquaint your Lordſhip, that Lord Bellamont thought it his duty not to break in upon your Lordſhip at an earlier day, leſt he ſhould interrupt you in giving an account of your high commiſſion to the King, or in taking an account of your own important affairs. But as your Lordſhip

has now been twelve days in town, he conceives that he may with propriety remind your Lordſhip of the diſreſpect thrown upon him by the meſſage delivered to him from your Lordſhip by your Aid-de-Camp, of which Lord Bellamont makes no doubt that your Lordſhip retains a perfect recollection; it having been of that force as to have obliged him to reſign his employment in the army, in order that he might be at liberty to call upon your Lordſhip for an adequate apology without incurring the King's diſpleaſure. But leſt your Lordſhip ſhould not have a minute recollection of that tranſaction at this diſtance of time, Lord Bellamont has ſtated it as follows:

"When Lord Bellamont, after ſeveral repeated attendances by appointment, on all which occaſions he had been put off without ſeeing your Lordſhip, did again wait upon your Lordſhip by appointment, the Aid-de-Camp in waiting having gone down to your Lordſhip and returned, addreſſed Lord Bellamont in an audible voice, and acquainted him, that he need not ſtay any longer, for that your Lordſhip *would* not be at leiſure to ſee *him* that day; and at the ſame time turning to ſeveral other perſons of different ranks and profeſſions, he told *them* that your Lordſhip requeſted *they* would wait, as your Lordſhip *would* ſee *them*, however late it might be before you could finiſh with them, or words to that effect. Lord Bellamont replied to the

the Aid-de-Camp: His Excellency will be pleaſed to aſcertain at what time he will ſee me. I have already waited ſeveral times by appointment, and have been ſent away each time. To which the Aid-de-Camp brought back the following meſſage to Lord Bellamont: His Excellency commands me to tell your Lordſhip, that he uſually does military buſineſs on Wedneſdays, and any other buſineſs on Thurſdays: That if your Lordſhip comes on either of thoſe days, and that his Excellency ſhall be at leiſure, he will ſee you among others in your turn. To which Lord Bellamont replied, Sir, you will be ſo good as to inform his Excellency, that as a Peer of the realm I have a right to audience: but if his Excellency does not know what he owes to me, I know what I owe to myſelf, and therefore will not wait upon him here or elſewhere, I will write a letter to his Excellency, ſtating my buſineſs, to which I expect he will ſhew due attention, as it nearly concerns a reſpectable corps of officers. This, my Lord, is, as Lord Bellamont conceives, an exact ſtate of the reciprocal meſſages which paſſed between your Lordſhip and Lord Bellamont: But as he did not take them down in writing, he cannot poſitively aver each ſyllable. This, however, he can poſitively affirm, that ſuch was the matter of the meſſage, and the

terms in which it was conceived, though manifeſtly ſoftened by the Aid-de-Camp; that the idea which it conveyed to every perſon preſent was that of an intentional indignity wantonly caſt on Lord Bellamont by your Lordſhip. Lord Bellamont conceives that an Aid-de-Camp is the authentic meſſenger of his ſuperiour, and therefore that a meſſage delivered by the one is as the *litera ſcripta* of the other. Lord Bellamont conſiders your Lordſhip alone reſponſible to him, and your Lordſhip the only perſon with whom he is to account. The injury is of publick notoriety, and therefore an affront upon record, which does not admit of any negociation.

Lord Townſhend having aſked what apology Lord Bellamont required, Lord Charlemont read the following article:

"The only apology which the nature of the offence will admit of, is that of aſking Lord Bellamont's pardon. Lord Bellamont does not mean to hurry your Lordſhip in any thing, but expects your Lordſhip's anſwer in a reaſonable time, at all events one day at leaſt before your Lordſhip leaves town."

Lord Townſhend made anſwer: I cannot aſk pardon, as it would be an acknowledgement of an offence I never intended.

Lord Charlemont replied: I am not at liberty to take back any other anſwer to Lord

Lord Bellamont than that your Lordſhip aſks his pardon, or deſires to take time to conſider of aſking it; I therefore intreat your Lordſhip will reflect before you lay me under an abſolute neceſſity of delivering another meſſage to your Lordſhip, which Lord Bellamont ſends with the utmoſt regret, and which I ſhall deliver with equal reluctancy.

Lord Townſhend having perſiſted in his refuſal, Lord Charlemont read to Lord Townſhend the following meſſage:

"I am enjoined by Lord Bellamont to tell your Lordſhip from him, that he conſiders you diveſted of every principle that conſtitutes the character of a man of honour."

Upon Lord Charlemont's delivery of this laſt meſſage, Lord Townſhend begged his permiſſion to call in a friend to be witneſs of it. Colonel Frazer having come in, Lord Townſhend requeſted that Lord Charlemont would again read this laſt meſſage. Lord Charlemont thereupon read the entire paper a ſecond time, and being requeſted by Lord Townſhend to carry back an anſwer to Lord Bellamont, Lord Charlemont, conformable to his private inſtructions from Lord Bellamont, replied, that any meſſage Lord Townſhend might have to ſend muſt be ſent by a meſſenger of his own.

On Saturday the 26th, at half an hour after eleven o'clock at night, Lord Bellamont received the following letter from Lord Ligonier:

MY LORD, *December 26th*, 1772.

" I have a meſſage to deliver to your " Lordſhip from Lord Townſhend, and beg " to know when I may be allowed to wait " on you. I have the honour to be,

" My Lord,

" Your Lordſhip's moſt obedient,

" Moſt humble ſervant,

North Audley-ſtreet. " LIGONIER."

(To the Earl of BELLAMONT.)

To which Lord Bellamont ſent the following anſwer:

" MY LORD,

" I this moment received the honour " of your Lordſhip's letter, communicating " to me that you have a meſſage to deliver " to me from Lord Townſhend, and deſiring " to know when I ſhall be at home to " receive your Lordſhip. I ſhall not go " abroad to-morrow, but will wait at home " to have the honour of receiving your " Lordſhip, and any commands you may " have for me. I have the honour to be,

" My Lord,

" Your Lordſhip's very humble,

" And obedient ſervant,

Curzon-ſtreet, " BELLAMONT."

Saturday night, half after 11 *o'clock.*

(To Lord Viſcount LIGONIER.)

On

On Sunday morning at eleven o'clock Lord Ligonier waited on Lord Bellamont, who anticipating Lord Ligonier, ſaid, "Before I receive the meſſage your Lordſhip has to deliver to me, I muſt beg leave to call in Lord Charlemont, in order that as Col. Frazer was preſent at the delivery of my meſſage to Lord Townſhend, Lord Charlemont may be preſent at the delivery of Lord Townſhend's meſſage to me; to which Lord Ligonier immediately conſented. Lord Charlemont being called in, Lord Bellamont ſaid, the tranſaction had, he ſuppoſed, been related to Lord Ligonier on the part of Lord Townſhend. He wiſhed it ſhould be related by Lord Charlemont on the part of him, for he ſhould be concerned to be miſconceived by Lord Ligonier, for whom he had a high reſpect; and that from the moment that Lord Ligonier ſhould have delivered Lord Townſhend's meſſage, he did not think it proper for himſelf or friend to ſpeak another word; of which Lord Ligonier having expreſſed his approbation, Lord Charlemont read the paper to Lord Ligonier, which he had by Lord Bellamont's deſire read to Lord Townſhend. Lord Ligonier then addreſſing Lord Bellamont, ſaid, "What will your Lordſhip ſay, when, notwithſtanding the force of this meſſage, I tell you I am authorized by Lord Townſhend to aſſure your Lordſhip,

Lordſhip, he never meant to offend you?" Lord Bellamont, after a little pauſe, replied, "I confeſs, my Lord, this is more than I expected; but ſince then Lord Townſhend's firſt care is to juſtify his intentions towards me even under his preſent ſituation, let him do it in ſuch a manner as to juſtify me in releaſing him from that ſituation. The apology your Lordſhip has now delivered to me is not yet entirely ſufficient." Lord Ligonier deſired leave to go back to Lord Townſhend, and ſhortly returned with the following meſſage: "Lord Townſhend has already aſſured your Lordſhip he never meant to offend you. He further aſſures you he is ſorry for the affair." Lord Bellamont then ſaid, "Before I proceed any further, I muſt deſire that Lord Ancram be ſent for, as he has this morning accepted the office of being my friend in the field if I ſhall be called upon." Lord Ancram being arrived, and informed by the Lords Charlemont and Ligonier of what had paſſed, the Lords Charlemont and Ancram declared that nothing more could be demanded; and then with Lord Ligonier ſaid, that Lord Bellamont could not ſurely require that Lord Townſhend ſhould aſk his pardon for an offence which he had now in the moſt ſatisfactory manner declared he had never committed. Lord Bellamont made anſwer,

"My

"My Lords, I feel as you do, that every thing is implied in this apology; but it is neceſſary that it be fully expreſſed;" and having deſired leave to retire into another room to conſider the matter more clearly, he returned with the following written paper, which he gave to Lord Ligonier, telling him at the ſame time, that he did not tie him down to the letter, but that was the purport of the only reparation he could receive, viz. "Lord Townſhend does admit that the meſſage delivered to Lord Bellamont by his Aid-de-Camp was highly offenſive; he therefore diſavows it as ſuch, and declares that it was not in his intentions to give Lord Bellamont any offence, and that he is very much concerned for the miſtake." Lord Ligonier accordingly waited on Lord Townſhend with the ſaid paper, and brought back to Lord Bellamont an apology conſonant to the full and entire purport of it, conceived in the moſt ſatisfactory terms. Lord Bellamont immediately requeſted Lord Ligonier would aſſure Lord Townſhend, that as Lord Townſhend had by that laſt apology done away the foundation of the meſſage delivered from him to Lord Townſhend by Lord Charlemont, he had very great pleaſure in declaring it cancelled and annulled.

CHARLEMONT. (L. S.)
ANCRAM. (L. S.)

"I cannot

" I cannot refuſe ſigning the paper delivered to me this morning without aſſigning my reaſons for it; and I flatter myſelf the motive of my declining it will juſtify me to the world.

" I aſſent to the facts and progreſſions as ſtated, but I was miſunderſtood if what I ſaid relative to Lord Townſhend was conſidered as a meſſage from him. It certainly was not Lord Townſhend's intentions it ſhould be ſo, though I was authoriſed to ſay it from Lord Townſhend to Lord Bellamont, which diſtinction I did not make to Lord Bellamont.

As I wiſhed, from motives of humanity, to bring the affair to an honourable concluſion without coming to extremities, I propoſed returning to Lord Townſhend: my view in ſo doing was that of promoting an accommodation honourable to both.

" If I conveyed any other idea to the Lords on my return from Lord Townſhend than a confirmation that his Lordſhip had intended no affront or injury to Lord Bellamont, and that he diſapproved the manner of the Aid-de-Camp, I have to regret that I had not the good fortune to explain myſelf according to my own ideas and thoſe of Lord Townſhend.

" In juſtice to Lord Townſhend, I muſt beg leave to obſerve, that whatever expreſ-

ſions

ſions of concern he might make uſe of on this miſunderſtanding, aroſe from the regret every man of honour muſt feel under a ſuppoſition of having given offence. This is what I underſtood from Lord Townſhend, and what I meant to convey.

" I cannot but perſevere in declining to ſign the paper, as I find upon conſideration that what I thought an explanation, equally honourable to both, may be conſtrued into a ſubmiſſive apology, which muſt appear humiliating to Lord Townſhend.

" What impreſſions may have been received from any expreſſions of mine in the many private converſations I have had on this painful event, I will not preſume to determine; but I declare upon my honour, I have had no other view than to terminate this affair to the honour of all parties, and ſhall lament if my endeavours ſhould be fruſtrated.

Jan. 29th, 1773. LIGONIER. (L. S.)

This is a true copy of the original in the hands of Lord Bellamont.

CHARLEMONT.
ANCRAM.

February 2, 1773.

This afternoon, between four and five o'clock, the long-ſubſiſting difference between Lord Townſhend and the Earl of Bellamont was

was finally decided in Mary-le-bone-fields, when the latter received a ball in the right ſide of his belly, near his groin. They were armed with ſmall ſwords, and a caſe of piſtols, but it was agreed to uſe the latter firſt. Lord Townſhend fired firſt, which gave the unfortunate wound, and Lord Bellamont diſcharged his piſtol immediately after, without effect. The ſeconds were, the Hon. Mr. Dillon for Lord Bellamont, and Lord Ligonier for Lord Townſhend. Lord Bellamont was immediately taken up, and put into a chaiſe, but, from the agony ariſing from his wound, he could not bear the motion; a chair was therefore immediately ſent for, and he was with great pain put into it, and carried to his lodgings, where, when he arrived, he deſired to be laid on his back. Mr. Bromfield, and other ſurgeons were immediately called in, who after ſome time, extracted the ball, and his Lordſhip recovered.

Their Lordſhips behaved to each other in the field with great politeneſs. When they had taken their ground, Lord Bellamont took off his hat, which was returned by Lord Townſhend, who aſked his antagoniſt which he choſe ſhould fire firſt. Lord Bellamont anſwered, he begged Lord Townſhend would, which was immediately complied with.

Sir

Sir GEORGE SAVILE'S *Addreſs to his Conſtituents, in the year* 1780, *is deſerving of preſervation. The following is a copy of it.*

To the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of York.

GENTLEMEN,

I VENTURE once more to make you a tender of my ſervice in Parliament. Give me leave, at the ſame time, to offer you my cordial thanks for all the indulgencies you have ſhewn me; and for your kind acceptance of my endeavours to perform the duty I had undertaken. I look upon that partiality and favour as a moſt honourable teſtimony, becauſe it proves that you entertain a conviction of the purity of my intentions, ſufficient to make you overlook every thing amiſs which did not proceed from the will.

In renewing my deſire to continue in your ſervice, I think it, however, my duty to confeſs to you, that it has not been without much ſerious conſideration, and more than common heſitation, that I have determined upon it. I muſt not omit making you aware, that it is by no means probable

probable I ſhould be able even to perform the mere duty of attendance as punctually as I have hitherto done; eſpecially if the duration of Parliament ſhould prove to be for ſeven years. By what I have in ſome degree experienced already, I have no reaſon to believe ſo long a continuance of ſuch an attendance would be perfectly conſiſtent with my health.

But there is ſomething more ſerious I have to ſay to you on this ſubject. The ſatisfaction and honour of attending your buſineſs, has ever overbalanced the labour: but my attendance during the laſt Parliament has been ſomething worſe than laborious; it has been diſcouraging, grievous, and painful. Look back, for a moment, upon the things which have been done, or (being done,) have been approved of, by that body, of which I have been a conſtituent part. Compare the preſent with the paſt ſituation of public affairs. Whether glory, conqueſt, and riches; or peace, content, liberty, and the enjoyment of your conſtitutional rights, be your principal objects—In which of them have you been gratified? I have been, in my collective capacity, a party to all theſe changes, and to all the meaſures which have produced them: ſupported in this mortifying ſituation with one only conſolation, a very great one indeed to my own mind, that of being

being able to aſſure you, that there has been no one meaſure, of all thoſe which have proved ſo ruinous and fatal, which I have not, as an individual, reſiſted, to the utmoſt of my power. A poor, barren, ineffectual, negative; and a miſerable claim to your favour, to have failed (as far as my poor and ſlender efforts are in queſtion) almoſt in every point regarding thoſe rights and that proſperity which I was ſpecially choſen to cultivate and to maintain.

I return to you, therefore, baffled and diſpirited, and I am ſorry that truth obliges me to add, with hardly a ray of hope of ſeeing any change in the miſerable courſe of public calamities.

On this melancholy day of account in rendering up to you my truſt, I deliver to you your ſhare of a country maimed and weakened, its treaſures laviſhed and miſſpent, its honours faded, and its conduct the laughing-ſtock of Europe; our nation in a manner without allies or friends, except ſuch as we have hired to deſtroy our fellow-ſubjects, and to ravage a country, in which we once claimed an invaluable ſhare. I return to you ſome of your principal privileges impeached and mangled. And, laſtly, I leave you, as I conceive at this hour and moment, fully, effectually, and abſolutely under the diſcretion and power of a military

force, which is to act without waiting for the authority of the civil magiſtrates; for it is fit you ſhould know, if you are not already informed, that an order iſſued in London, (at a moment when the violence of the riots and the remiſſneſs of the civil magiſtrate might render neceſſary an extraordinary and violent temporary exertion of the military,) that order, I ſay, has, as I have good grounds to believe, been extended to the whole kingdom; where neither of thoſe cauſes exiſted in any degree ſufficient to juſtify ſo deciſive and extraordinary a meaſure; and I do not know of that order being recalled.

In this ſtate of public affairs, and with this account to render of my commiſſion, judge whether I can boldly and chearfully, or ſupported by any rational confidence, boaſt to you as candidates are wont to do, of what I will do, and what I will undertake for your ſervice.

For this reaſon, avoiding even the uſual ſtyle of ſuch addreſſes, and forbearing as well the forward promiſes as the ſuperficial humbleneſs of phraſe in uſe on theſe occaſions, I make it a ſolemn duty to lay before you, without diſguiſe or palliation, the preſent ſtate of your concerns as they appear to me, and the gloomy proſpect which lies before us.

Some

Some have been accuſed of exaggerating the public misfortunes, nay, of having endeavoured to help forward the miſchief, that they might afterwards raiſe diſcontents. I am willing to hope, that neither my temper, nor my ſituation in life, will be thought naturally to urge me to promote miſery, diſcord, or confuſion; or to exult in the ſubverſion of order, or in the ruin of property. I have no reaſon to contemplate with pleaſure the poverty of our country, the increaſe of our debts and of our taxes; or the decay of our commerce—Truſt not however to my report. Reflect, compare, and judge for yourſelves.

But under all theſe diſheartening circumſtances, I could yet entertain a chearful hope, and undertake again the commiſſion with alacrity, as well as zeal, if I could ſee any effectual ſteps taken to remove the original cauſe of the miſchief. "Then would there be a hope."

Till the purity of the conſtituent body, and thereby that of the repreſentative be reſtored, there is NONE.

While the electors ſell their voices to the member, and the member diſtreſſes his fortune to buy them, Parliament will be the purchaſe of the Miniſter. Parliamentmen will find ways of partaking other advantages than merely their ſhare in common

with you, of thoſe good meaſures which they ſhall promote, and of thoſe good laws which they ſhall enact for your government and their own: and the modern-improved arts of corruption, by contracts, ſubſcriptions, and jobs, is attended with this perverſe and vexatious conſequence; that their benefit is not only unconnected with yours, but it grows upon your diſtreſs. They feed on the expence; they fatten on every extravagance that art and ill-conduct can engraft on the natural diſadvantages of a remote, raſh, ill-fated, impolitic, and unſucceſsful war. The Miniſter's direct intereſt (nay his ſafety) meanwhile, requiring him to puſh the deſperate game, and even in ſelf-defence, to encreaſe that very expence which is his crime; to intrench himſelf ſtill deeper in corruption, and by headlong and unmeaſured extravagance, to have the means of juſtifying, to the faithful Commons, his former miſmanagement and miſdeeds. —See where this ends, but forget not where it begins.

I am led here very naturally to ſpeak upon the ſubject of certain regulations, which have been the object of your late aſſemblies and deliberations. Indeed, I have brought myſelf to this matter almoſt unavoidably, but not unwillingly. I gladly embrace this moſt public opportunity of delivering my ſentiments,

ments, not only to all my conſtituents, but to thoſe likewiſe, not my conſtituents, whom yet in the large ſenſe I repreſent, and am faithfully to ſerve; not only to twenty thouſand, my electors, but to hundreds of thouſands in the county I repreſent, (to go no farther,) who are to ſuffer under the bad conduct of Parliament; and of declaring my intentions, regarding the two chief articles contained in the reſolutions agreed to at your late meetings; I mean, rendering parliaments triennial, and adding to the number of county repreſentatives.

I do not intend to give my voice, if I have the honour of continuing in your ſervice, for the change of ſeptennial parliaments. And this, not becauſe I am ſo ſanguine as ſome are, in a full perſuaſion, that it will be a cure for all our evils; no, nor even that I promiſe myſelf it will be attended with any ſuch ſure hope of conſiderable advantage, (at leaſt, if unaccompanied by ſome other ſteps tending to purify the ſources of election and repreſentation;) but chiefly, becauſe, on the beſt information I have obtained, I have reaſon to believe it is the mind and deſire of a very large number of my conſtituents: this ſeeming to me to be the one point (at leaſt with diſtinguiſhed preference) on which the ſender, not he who is ſent, has the perfect right to judge; and

that,

that, even if after all, I ſhould have miſtaken their general ſenſe, it will be at leaſt the ſafer error; ſince there is a manifeſt difference between the obtruding one's ſelf for ſeven years on him who wiſhes to have his choice again at the end of three, and returning for his approbation at three; when he might perhaps have been well content to truſt one for ſeven.

I have a momentary pleaſure in adding (eſpecially when ſupported by your opinions,) that I am willing to flatter myſelf, rather good than evil may ariſe from the change.

But I look upon reſtoring election and repreſentation in ſome degree (for I expect no miracles) to their original purity, to be that, without which all other efforts will be vain and ridiculous, The tenant-right, or good-will of a leaſe of three years, is as ſaleable as that of a leaſe of ſeven. It will find its price at both the London and country markets. It will be bought, it will be ſold. The member will be as manageable, if the conſtituent be as venal. And they will not be afraid to meet at market as ofren as you pleaſe.

The adding to the country repreſentation, if by no means a perfect cure, ſeems yet to me to be the plaineſt, and beſt propoſition for this purpoſe, that has yet come under my obſervation; I truſt, likewiſe, it may be

practicable,

practicable. I therefore embrace it, not only from a deference to your opinion, but with an approbation of my own. Yet not flattering you, that it appears to me one of thoſe matters eaſy of execution, or to be done with a thought; on the contrary, it is more complicated (as it ſeems to me more effectual) than the firſt-mentioned alteration. But this is no time to talk of ſmall rubs or difficulties. If ſomething be not done, you may, indeed, retain the outward form of your Conſtitution, but not the power thereof.

For it is too ſerious a truth to be concealed, and, indeed, it is too late ſeriouſly to attempt to conceal it, that if the Electors forgetting the ſolemn duty they owe to the millions of their fellow-ſubjects, whoſe rights they are in the firſt inſtance intruſted with: if forgetting the ſacred truſt repoſed in them, of chooſing thoſe who are to govern thoſe millions; if forgetting that they are therefore a ſort of repreſentatives of all the people (who would be too numerous to vote themſelves;) I ſay, if forgetting theſe things, and ſhamefully proſtituting themſelves, they are become ſo profligate as to ſell themſelves and their country; let them not wonder (nay ſcarcely can they complain without ſhame) if thoſe whom they chooſe, imitating their conduct, retail daily thoſe rights which they have bought, whether it be at the ſeptennial, triennial,

triennial, or annual fairs and markets. We can converſe thus without a bluſh.

Neither time permits, nor does propriety allow me to enter into arguments in ſupport of a ſentiment of which (much I think to your honour) you have declared your approbation; but although it ſuits neither the time nor the circumſtance, to argue and debate, I truſt you will not think I am out of the line of propriety, of duty, or of the reſpect I owe you, in thus making a public declaration of my opinions and intentions in matters concerning which, after the tender I have made of my ſervice, you have an unqueſtionable right, as you muſt have a natural wiſh, to be informed.

When I began this paper, I had reaſon to believe the time preſſed; I was ſoon confirmed in what I had heard. It was become material to addreſs you quickly, if at all; but although what I have written has been the work of a few hours, do not think that the matter has not again and again been the ſubject of deliberate thoughts; I ſhould not have dared to have preſented you with crude and undigeſted ideas or the fancy of a moment; but on the other hand, ſo innattentive have I been to the advantages this addreſs might receive, in its form, from the aſſiſtance of abler perſons than myſelf, that I venture to ſubmit it thus publicly to you, without the opportunity of communicating it

to

to thoſe whoſe principles, judgment, and line of conduct in the public walk, I have been habituated to look up to with high reſpect and eſteem.

My buſineſs is not to write ably to you, but to write with ſincerity. The relation that ſtands now between us, gives you a right, if I may ſo ſpeak, to my unmended ſentiments; and I willingly ſubmit every defect to your cenſure, rather than be ſuppoſed to uſe management and art, or to conſult what is conformable to perſonal or party conſiderations, inſtead of that which unbridled truth (according to my conception of it) requires of me. What further ſteps may be in contemplation towards obtaining the laudable object of our wiſhes, I do not know; but it is not probable that what has lately ariſen will ſlacken the zeal of thoſe who have already ſtepped forward in the buſineſs. With that idea upon my mind, it is impoſſible for me to conclude without expreſſing an earneſt wiſh, that whatever is thought of may be purſued with that true ſpirit of firmneſs and moderation, which belongs to the cauſe of juſtice; and above all, that by every means that can be deviſed, a good underſtanding and union may be inſured amongſt reſpectable men of all ranks and deſcriptions, who agree in the main principles of liberty; although there may be

ſhades

ſhades of difference in ſmaller points, or in matters not calling for immediate diſcuſſion. Indeed you will find it true wiſdom, and a very honourable policy, to ſtrenthen the cauſe of your country with every honeſt aid that can be obtained.—No public cauſe was ever carried by divided efforts.

Till I have the honour of meeting you in the exerciſe of the great and reſpectable function of chooſing your repreſentatives, I beg leave to ſubſcribe myſelf, Gentlemen, with perfect reſpect, and a remembrance of all your kindneſs,

Your moſt obliged,
And faithful humble ſervant,
G. SAVILE.

Newcaſtle-upon-Tyne, Sept. 5, 1780.

Proceedings of the GENERAL CHAMBER *of Manufacturers of* Great Britain, *on the* French Treaty. *From the ninth of February to the twenty-ſeventh of March* 1787.

Proceedings of a General Meeting held February 10, 1787; Tho. Walker, Eſq. *in the Chair.*

The report of the Committee of the ninth of this month was read. The following is a copy of the REPORT:—

IN compliance with the orders of the General Meeting, held on the fifth inſtant, by

by which the committee is directed to enquire into the following points, viz.

I. What laws muſt be repealed to make room for the French treaty?

II. What articles were prohibited by the treaty of Utrecht, now admitted?

III. Does the French treaty put an end to the treaty with Portugal?

IV. Are any articles exported to Portugal not included in the tariff?

V. Alſo the committee are requeſted to get the moſt authentic information, reſpecting the doubts expreſſed on their minutes on various articles of the French treaty?

Your committee have referred to thoſe doubts expreſſed upon the minutes; and it is with infinite concern they perceive, that no anſwer whatſoever has hitherto been inſerted upon the minutes reſpecting them. It appears by the minutes, that the firſt Fourteen Articles of the treaty were read at a committee, held on the 21ſt November laſt; and the committee was adjourned.

On the 28th November, another committee was held, and the following doubts were ordered to be inſerted upon the minutes, viz.

" On reconſidering the Fifth Article of the treaty laſt concluded with France; the committee have ſome doubt, whether ſufficient remedy be provided againſt artiſts or manufacturers

manufacturers being conveyed out of the kingdom, under the denomination of ſervants to ſubjects of France, leaving this country?

"And a doubt alſo ariſes, whether this Article does not in certain caſes repeal the laws now in force againſt the exportation of ſundry raw materials, tools, and utenſils?

"And it is alſo doubted, whether any protection be afforded by this treaty againſt the importation from France of any articles, for the manufacture and ſale of which an excluſive privilege is granted by the King's Letters Patent?

"It alſo ſeems reaſonable to them, that if a drawback be allowed on the exportation of French wines, and other articles from hence; a drawback ſhould be allowed on the manufactures of this country, when exported from France.

The firſt and ſecond clauſes of the above doubts appear beyond all other things moſt important to the welfare of this kingdom: And your committee, upon carefully peruſing the words of the Fifth Article, and comparing them with the convention lately publiſhed, (which is totally ſilent on this point, although intended to remove other doubtful parts of the treaty,) have too great reaſon to apprehend, that conſequences of the moſt alarming nature will enſue, when laws are made (as ſtipulated in the Four-

teenth

teenth Article) to give effect to all parts of this Treaty.——If theſe apprehenſions are juſt, the Fifth Article, protecting only in certain caſes the prohibitions on the *import* trade, *leaves open the exportation* to France of all the raw materials of Great Britain at preſent prohibited—whether *wool*, *fuller's-earth*, *raw hides*, or any other material—and alſo, all the tools and utenſils uſed in our manufactures; it expoſes us likewiſe to the loſs of our artiſts and Workmen of every ſort, who may chuſe to emigrate under the deſcription of ſervants to Frenchmen leaving this kingdom; "any LAW privilege, grant, immunities or cuſtoms to the contrary notwithſtanding."

The firſt queſtion of the General Meeting, viz. "What laws muſt be repealed to make "room for the French treaty?" is of ſo extenſive a nature, that your committee have not been able to collect ſo full information as they wiſh to do: They have ſtated above generally, that the laws at preſent exiſting againſt the exportation of wool, raw hides, tools, and the emigration of artiſts muſt be repealed; (as agreed on in the Fourteenth Article;) otherwiſe the ſubjects of France, chuſing to reſide for a time in Great Britain, and then to return home to their native country, for the purpoſes of commerce and trade, cannot enjoy all the advantages granted them by the Fifth Article of the treaty.

But,

But, beſides the laws reſtraining exportation, there are many others which, in favour of our own manufactures, prohibit the importation of foreign goods, as the 4th Edward IV. chap. 1. by which no cloths wrought beyond ſea, ſhall be brought into England, and ſet to ſale; the 3d Edw. IV. chap. 3d and 4th; the 1ſt of Rich. III. chap. 12th; the 7th Eliz. chap. 7th; the 13th and 14th Charles II. chap. 13th; which contain a variety of prohibitions, on the importation of a great number of articles in the woollen, iron, copper and glaſs manufactures; every one of which laws muſt neceſſarily be repealed. And it has alſo been provided by a law, 1ſt of Rich. II. c. 9th and the 32d Hen. VIII. c. 15. "That "no alien ſhall ſell by retail, nor take any "leaſe of a houſe or ſhop to trade in," which muſt by this treaty alſo be repealed, as the permiſſion to ſell by retail is not (as it was in the treaty of Utrecht) excepted. And it may be proper to remark here, that any relaxation of the laws, to prevent the clandeſtine landing of goods, will have a worſe effect upon our manufactures, than even a direct importation upon certain duties; and your committee obſerve, that by the free approach allowed to French veſſels upon the coaſt; and the time given by the treaty to make entries, and to correct them when

made, an alteration of the Cuſtom-houſe laws (made as well for the protection of fair trade, as the collection of the revenue) muſt take place; from which they apprehend great miſchiefs may enſue.

The 2d queſtion, requiring an account of thoſe articles of French manufacture, againſt the importation of which the treaty of Utrecht protected this country; but which are admitted under the preſent treaty, is alſo an important conſideration, By that treaty we had permiſſion to ſend many commodities to France, without opening our market reciprocally to them. Amongſt others were *woollens*, *cutlery*, and *hardware*. In theſe articles we were protected in the poſſeſſion of our *own market* by the treaty of Utrecht; but which by the preſent treaty is given up to France—and your committee cannot help remarking upon this head, that although the articles called *Sellerie*, are alſo admitted into this kingdom from France; yet they are not to become ſubject to any duty to countervail the exciſe originally paid upon leather in Great Britain, which amounts to 15 per cent.

But your committee cannot omit obſerving here, that the alteration of the laws againſt ſmuggling above hinted at, appears to them an object of moſt alarming conſequence; not only with regard to the illicit introduction

introduction of goods importable into this kingdom under the treaty; but alſo in reſpect to the facility which various articles of the treaty afford the French of bringing into the kingdom a number of goods againſt the importation of which the prohibitions ſtill remain—particularly all commodities of gold and ſilver, ribbons, ſilks, laces, gloves, &c. which lying in ſo very ſmall a compaſs renders the facility of ſmuggling them perfectly practicable. With regard to Portugal, your committee have not been able to learn more than that it is generally underſtood, no new treaty hath been concluded with that kingdom; and that the Methuen Treaty, by which the importation of Britiſh woollen, and other manufactures into Portugal is ſecured, will be at an end, unleſs a diminution of the duty upon Portugal wines, one-third below its preſent amount, accompanies the lowering that upon French wines. If the Treaty now in force ſhall be diſcontinued, there are ſome articles exported to that kingdom not included in the French tariff, for which it may be difficult to find another market; and your committee leave it to every man to revolve in his own mind the conſequences to the exports and imports of Britain, which will probably attend the ſtopping of this ancient and valuable trade.

It

It has not yet been obſerved, that no ſtipulation is made in the treaty reſpecting the allowance of drawbacks on the exportation of goods imported from the one country to the other.

There is no queſtion but France will expect that England ſhall allow her wines, oils, cambricks, &c. to be paſſed through England with ſuch a drawback of the duties paid on importation as the wines of Portugal, the oils of Italy, and the linens of Germany now are. By this means France will enjoy the privilege of ſupplying our colonies with theſe articles. This advantage ought to have ſome equivalent return from France, and ſhe ſhould allow our woollen, hardware, pottery, ſaddlery, and cottons, to paſs in like manner through France into her colonies. Unleſs ſome arrangement of this kind takes place, there is no reciprocity in the treaty, as far as relates to the colonial trade of both nations—It is true that the treaty is confined to Europe in words; but it is not, in fact, unleſs England refuſes to allow the ſame drawbacks on French wines, oils, and linens, as on thoſe of Portugal, Italy, and Germany—If this can be done, a corner of our trade will be preſerved for thoſe countries from whence we may expect ſome return.

If *all* articles are open to exportation, the balance will be greatly in favour of France, as

the wines, oils, and linen, have no reciprocal articles to place againſt them; and therefore ſome Engliſh articles ſhould be allowed a drawback in France, as woollens and hardware, againſt wines and linen; but woollens and hardware from France ſhould not be allowed a drawback in England.

It is ſaid that the matter of drawbacks is an affair of internal regulation, which each nation may ſettle to their own liking. If ſo, the collection of articles for colonial conſumption is moſt unfortunate for this country, whoſe intereſts have not in this reſpect been conſidered in the Treaty. And there ought to have been either a fair regulation of drawbacks, or ſuch a ſelection of articles as would not give ſo great advantage to France; who, by the preſent arrangement, will ſupply our colonies with wines, oils, and linens, to an immenſe amount, while ſhe may, if ſhe pleaſes, refuſe to let a ſingle article of Engliſh produce paſs into her colonies.

Reſolutions, February 10, 1787.

Reſolved unanimouſly, I. That the fair equality of a Commercial Treaty does not conſiſt in ſtating the ſpecific articles of one kingdom againſt another, under reciprocal duties; but in admitting goods of nearly the ſame value or amount into each kingdom reſpectively, either duty-free, or under ſuch duties

duties as ſhall effectually favour the conſumption.

II. That in a Commercial Treaty between two countries, where it ſhall ſo happen, that the principal advantages on one ſide ariſe chiefly from an article or articles of which the other can never ſend any in return; in order to effect a real equality, this balance againſt the latter ought to be made up by the admiſſion of ſuch other articles as the latter can ſend to the former, either duty-free, or under duties which may effectually favour the conſumption for ever.

III. That in a commercial intercourſe between two countries, the advantages ariſing to one kingdom from the admiſſion of a produce peculiar to its climate and ſoil, by the other kingdom, are durable and permanent advantages, which muſt always continue to operate in favour of the former againſt the latter; but that advantages ariſing from the preſent ſuperiority in moſt manufactures are variable and tranſient; and that it is therefore expedient, in balancing ſuch manufactures againſt ſuch produce, to ſecure for ever to the former their preſent advantages, by means of low duties, and ſuch other ſtipulations and proviſions as may ſeem beſt adapted to the purpoſe.

IV. That the duties under which the manufactures forming ſuch balance ſhould be

admitted, ought to be lower than the duties on the ſame articles from all other foreign countries; and ſo low as effectually to favour their conſumption, even againſt the home manufactures of the ſame kind; otherwiſe the fair equality is perpetually liable to be deſtroyed.

V. That it is much more indiſpenſably neceſſary that ſuch manufactures ſhould be protected in their own home-market, by unequally high duties; otherwiſe from the gradual proficiency of the other country in ſimilar manufactures, it may happen in a little time, that the advantages, which were at firſt balanced againſt each other, may all ſhift to one ſide.

VI. That no fair equality can exiſt, if in one kingdom there ſhall ſtill remain internal regulations partially favourable to their own, and oppreſſive to foreign manufactures, while in the other country no ſuch regulations do, or from the nature of the conſtitution can, exiſt.

VII. That the Committee of this Chamber be directed to enquire how far the preſent treaty with France be conſtructed on theſe principles, and to report their opinion thereon.

VIII. That this meeting is impreſſed with the magnitude of the treaty with France, and ſenſible of the importance of its operation upon a variety of intereſts. That neither the report of their committee, nor the

 inveſtigation

inveſtigation of any individuals, has, in their reſult, furniſhed this meeting with ſufficient information to warrant their pronouncing at this time any certain opinion upon its merits. That the prodigious complication of detail which it involves, and the acknowledged novelty of the plan, demand the moſt ſerious and deliberate conſideration. That a due judgment of it may be facilitated by a peruſal of certain accounts, which have been ordered by the Honourable the Houſe of Commons, but which accounts, not being yet printed, cannot furniſh the aſſiſtance neceſſary to a proper determination. That this meeting cannot hear without alarm, that the Houſe of Commons intend to come to a vote which may be deciſive of the treaty on Monday next. That if the treaty be found, upon a further review of its nature and tendency, to be really advantageous to this country, the meeting is apprehenſive, that ſo great a good ſhould reſt upon the hazard of a ſingle immature vote; but that the terrors of this meeting are augmented and aggravated, if upon more minute enquiry the treaty ſhould turn out to be detrimental or pernicious, as a precipitate reſolution may entail upon the nation the moſt fatal conſequences.

That upon all theſe views, this meeting is of opinion it is indiſpenſably neceſſary to petition that Honourable Houſe, to poſtpone

for

for ſome time, the coming to any reſolution upon the principle or merits of the ſaid treaty, which may be deciſive, of either its adoption or rejection.

A draft of a petition was read, of which the following is a Copy;

To the Honourable the HOUSE OF COMMONS;

The Petition of the ſeveral Manufacturers, whoſe names are hereunto ſubſcribed, from their General Chamber of Manufacturers of Great Britain,

Humbly Sheweth,

THAT your petitioners duly impreſſed with the ſerious and awful importance of the Treaty of Commerce, now pending with France, beg leave in all humility to repreſent,

That the ſaid treaty, involving a vaſt complication of detail affecting a variety of the greateſt intereſts; and comprehending a prodigious change in the commercial ſyſtem of this country, is an object of the moſt momentous conſideration.

That your petitioners, after the moſt careful inveſtigation, which ſuch ſources of information as they have been able to conſult hitherto have afforded them, are not capable of forming any certain judgment of a treaty fraught with ſuch magnitude, novelty, and variety of matter.

That

That your petitioners cannot but be ſeriouſly alarmed at hearing that this Honourable Houſe have determined to come to a deciſive vote upon the ſaid treaty this day.

That your petitioners, remembering with gratitude the favour and indulgence which they experienced from this Honourable Houſe on a former occaſion, and the providental effects which were then univerſally allowed to have reſulted from delay, humbly conceive, that they have at preſent ſtill ſtronger reaſons to requeſt time for the purpoſe of enquiry and deliberation, before this Honourable Houſe ſhall come to any reſolution which may be deciſive upon this great meaſure;

And therefore your petitioners moſt humbly implore this Honourable Houſe, to poſtpone the adoption of any ſuch reſolution—for the important reaſons above ſtated, and for ſuch time as to the wiſdom of this Honourable Houſe ſhall ſeem meet.

And your petitioners ſhall ever pray.

Reſolved unanimouſly, That the ſame be ſigned by the Members preſent, and preſented to the Honourable the Houſe of Commons on Monday next.

THOMAS WALKER, *Chairman.*

Pro-

Proceedings of a General Meeting, held February 17, 1787. Jos. Wedgwood, Eſq. *in the chair.*

Thomas Walker, Eſq. reported that the Petition of the Chamber was preſented to the Honourable the Houſe of Commons, by Mr. Alderman Newnham.

Part of the report of the Committee of the 16th inſt. was read, of which the following is a copy:

YOUR Committee having been directed by a general meeting, held on the 10th of this month, to enquire and to report how far the preſent treaty with France is conſtructed on certain principles then unanimouſly reſolved, have proceeded with all diligence, to collect what authentick information they could, and in purſuance of their duty, beg leave to ſubmit their opinions, ſeverally and in order, on the reſpective heads referred to their conſideration.

The firſt reſolution is as follows: "That the fair equality of a Commercial Treaty does not conſiſt in ſtating the ſpecifick articles of one kingdom againſt another, under reciprocal duties; but in admitting goods of nearly the ſame value or amount into each kingdom reſpectively, either duty free, or under ſuch duties as ſhall effectually favour the conſumption." And here your committee are ſorry to obſerve in the very beginning, that on the face of the treaty they

do not perceive the leaſt appearance of the fair equality, required by this Chamber. On the contrary they ſee much ſeeming inequality. While the wines, brandies, vinegars, and oils of France are to be admitted under duties, which will effectually favour the increaſe of their conſumption here to a very conſiderable amount; the reſt of the tariff conſiſts wholly in that which this Chamber has repeatedly pronounced not to be a fair equality, namely, "in ſtating the ſpecifick articles of one kingdom againſt another, under reciprocal duties. Your committee, however, do not mean to deny that under ſuch reciprocal duties ſome advantage, for the preſent, may ariſe to this kingdom in certain articles; but in others, excluſive of the productions above-mentioned, the gain will be as deciſive on the ſide of the French, particularly in glaſs, lawns, and cambricks, richly ornamented porcelain of Sêve, moſt probably in ſuperfine cloths of certain colours, and in light fabrics for ſummer wear, as well as in the extenſive article of millinery; which, as your committee have been informed, comprehends not only caps, hats, bonnets, ruffles and ſuch ſmall articles, but neckkerchiefs alſo, cloaks, aprons, and fancy dreſſes of every kind, ſize, and deſcription. With reſpect to theſe articles which your committee have enumerated as advantageous to France, they obſerve that from the riſk

of

of introducing a commodity at once ſo brittle and ſo bulky as glaſs, they believe it not to have been ſmuggled into this country; and the premium of inſurance on ready-made cloaths, clandeſtinely imported, being at 40l. per cent. a very ſmall quantity indeed (though ſome little your committee are well aſſured) did find its way into our market. The ſame too may be ſaid of all articles included under millinery from France. The danger, therefore, in theſe branches is wholly new; and conſequently cannot be eaſily aſcertained. Cambricks and lawns, it is true, were very generally ſmuggled, but the premium of inſurance being ſo high as 16 per cent. on the average, our Iriſh and Scotch manufactures of theſe goods did notwithſtanding increaſe, and the latter more eſpecially, as your committee do know, was doubled in the ſpace of four or five years from 1780 or 81 to Michaelmas 1785. But the duty of the tariff being very much below what the article would bear, and what was actually paid to the ſmuggler, the difficulty of the competition in the Britiſh market, is proportionably increaſed to the prejudice of our own manufactures, and a new danger incurred, which may probably be fatal to them. On the other hand, your committee preſume it to be notorious, that moſt, if not all our articles which are now to be directly admitted, did before get into France

circuitouſly to a very great amount. Large orders were ſent to this country from the free ports of France and the neighbouring territories; from whence your committee have good reaſon to be perſuaded, that the goods were conveyed into the interior part of France by ſome clandeſtine means not particularly known to your committee; and as far as your committee could learn, the aggregate expences of this illicit importation did not enhance the price of the goods to the conſumer in France, ſo much as the duties will under the preſent treaty: ſo that the French manufacturer will have no new difficulty of competition to apprehend. From the ſame cauſes too it will be found, that the extent of the advantages which England will receive, are ſubject to much uncertainty in any calculation. But thoſe of France are ſure in the articles above-mentioned, and eſpecially in the encreaſed conſumption of her wines, brandies, vinegars, and oils: and your committee muſt not forget to add, that in all theſe particulars, *France gains here a market more or leſs new, without the loſs of an old one, while England at leaſt hazards the lucrative markets of Portugal and Spain.*

To the ſecond reſolution your committee will not anſwer at large, as the eſſence of it is included in thoſe which follow, and probably its chief object was to mark more clearly

clearly the connection of the latter, with a principle before ſanctioned by the Chamber, in their reſolutions on the Iriſh propoſitions. Your committee, therefore, will content themſelves with obſerving that wines, brandies, vinegars, and oils, are undoubtedly "articles of which Great Britain can never "ſend any return," if ſhe were permitted ſo to do, which ſhe is not: but that on the other hand, "no articles which ſhe can ſend, are admitted on ſuch terms, as may effectually favour the conſumption *for ever:*" conſequently on the principle eſtabliſhed by the Chamber in the reſolution, "no real "equality is effected."

The third reſolution your committee have more fully conſidered. They perceive the wines, brandies, oils, and vinegars of France, to be indiſputably "productions peculiar to their climate and ſoil," ſo as to be generally eſteemed ſuperior to the ſimilar produce of every other country. It follows, therefore, that "the advantages which will ariſe to France from the admiſſion of theſe articles here agreeably to the tariff, will be durable and permanent advantages, and muſt always continue to operate in favour of France againſt Great Britain." It muſt alſo be recollected, that until Great Britain ſhall be perfectly acquainted with the ultimate fate of her trade with Portugal and Spain, ſhe cannot determine

mine how much the advantages of theſe articles to France, may or may not exceed the amount of that boon which the negociator of this country may have intended to give, or of the advantages which he may have conſented to take for an equivalent: neither can it be known, what ſacrifices of our own exports we may be compelled to make, by conſequence of ſhewing this favour to France. On the other hand, your committee cannot but notice with regret, that no admiſſion is given to the produce of our fiſheries, which, under the faith of treaties more ancient than the convention of 1703, conſtituted ſo profitable a branch of our commerce to Portugal; if we ratify any act which that power may think a violation of that treaty, it is not to be expected that ſhe will regard, on her part, her own prior engagements towards us. There is alſo one other omiſſion which your committee muſt point out, the omiſſion of a claſs of manufactures formed from a material for which this iſland was pre-eminently renowned from its firſt diſcovery; your committee allude to our manufactures of tin, which has of late been worked up into ſo many new ſhapes by the invention of Engliſh artificers. This omiſſion is the more remarkable, becauſe *unwrought tin* is one of the articles admitted from England into France,

France, even by the prohibitory edict of July the 17th, 1785.

Your committee hope they ſhall not be deemed to have digreſſed from the purpoſes of the enquiry, entruſted to them, by thus remarking what is not in the treaty; ſince they have thus ſhewn how the principle reſolved by the chamber, might have been carried into execution. They will now proceed, as they were directed, to examine what is in the treaty.

The only advantages which can be derived to Great Britain, muſt ariſe from her "preſent ſuperiority in manufactures, which is variable and tranſient." On looking over the tariff, your committee cannot diſcover a ſingle manufacture, of which the raw material is excluſively our own. To all our firſt and ſecond cloths, more or leſs Spaniſh wool is indiſpenſably requiſite; and if at any future time Spain ſhould prohibit the exportation of her wool to us, and allow it to France under the family compact, which is eſtabliſhed by the preſent treaty, in ſuperceſſion of our two treaties of Paris in 1763 and 1783—all theſe branches of our great ſtaple muſt be transferred to our rivals; nor are the kinds of woollens, which are made of our own fleeces, of a quality not imitable by the wool of other countries.

In regard to our cotton manufactures, we are

are dependant on foreign ſtates for one half at leaſt of the raw material conſumed therein. For one eighth we depend on France herſelf, who is to be our competitor in her own markets; and for as much more of the fineſt ſort, on Portugal.

If theſe ſupplies ſhould be ſtopped, however we may ſtill be able to ſatisfy our home demand, we ſhall certainly be incapacitated from puſhing any advantages which otherwiſe may be ſuppoſed to be opened to us by the preſent treaty. And here your Committee are ſincerely grieved to add, what they have heard on credible authority, that France has lately laid a duty equal to 4d. per lb. on the exportation of her own cotton wool; and is, beſides, negociating with Portugal, to obtain an excluſive right of purchaſing all the cotton of the Brazils.

As to our hardwares, your Committee find in a ſummary of the evidence before the Lords on the Iriſh propoſitions (which was publiſhed by the General Chamber) that the iron annually imported into Great Britain, is no leſs than 55,000 tons, while only 30,000 tons are ſaid to be made here. The duty on iron imported is 2l. 16s. 1½d. which appears to be abſolutely neceſſary, "becauſe "it is with the utmoſt difficulty we can "keep pace with the Ruſſian iron, and "therefore it is impoſſible for us to lower

"our

"our price." In France, your Committee learn that the importation duty into the provinces of the Five Great Farms is no more than 12s. 6d. ſterling per ton, including the 10 five per cents: iron is ſubject alſo in theſe Great Farms to a particular ſtamp duty, &c. amounting to 1l. 5s. per ton more, which makes in all 1l. 17s. 6d. But this ſtamp duty is not levied in a great part of France, that is to ſay, in all the diſtricts dependent on the Parliaments of Aix, Bourdeaux, Rennes, Benſançon, and Douai, as well as within the Supreme Councils of Perpignan, Arras, Colmar, and Nancy; this is a circumſtance of conſequence in ſettling the countervailing duties in France. And your committee think it not improper here to remark, the danger of our loſing a conſiderable trade in anchors, which it appears we have with Portugal.

Your committee think it unneceſſary to repreſent at length, that hemp and flax, leather, wood for cabinet ware, copper, ſilk for the fabrick of gauzes, clays for porcelain and pottery, and the raw materials for glaſs, are not peculiar to this iſland.

In reſpect to coals, with which we are ſuppoſed to be peculiarly ſupplied; your committee ought not to omit the information delivered by one of our members at the laſt General Meeting, "That having

"lately

" lately been in France, he knew there was " a fine vein of coal in the neighbourhood " of Boulogne." There are coals alſo, and iron mines in various parts of French Flanders. To which your committee muſt add, that by the 7th article of the treaty, being intitled to all the indulgencies of the moſt favoured nation, the French may demand the benefits of the 31ſt Geo. II. c. 15. and the 13 Geo. III. c. 17. by which culm may be exported to Liſbon at one ſhilling 12-20ths of a penny the chaldron. And for every uſe of the furnace, though not of the forge, your committee have been told that culm is as ſerviceable as coal of any other deſcription.

In none of theſe manufactures are the French intirely ignorant: and ſome of them we ourſelves received from that country. But your committee are aſſured, that they have labour certainly one half-cheaper; and many of their moſt induſtrious provinces (particularly the whole of French Flanders) are very lightly taxed, not above twelve or thirteen ſhillings per head on the average; and ſome of their manufacturing towns have peculiar and extenſive privileges; and above all, they are exempted from the " bad policy and deſtructive effects of the exciſe laws, which render a large capital neceſſary for the manufacturer, greatly enhance the price

of finiſhed goods to the conſumer without producing an adequate remedy to the ſtate; and ſubject the manufacturer to the vexatious controul of revenue officers; who being at the ſame time admitted into the ſecrets of his buſineſs, act as ſpies upon all his operations, communicate his improvements, which have coſt him great labour and expence, to others, perhaps to *foreign rivals*, and thus effectually check the exertions of genius and invention." The danger of divulging the operations of the Britiſh manufacturer to foreign rivals is infinitely increaſed by the privilege given by the treaty to French ſubjects, who may now openly and avowedly commence ſimilar manufactures in his very neighbourhood.

There remains then only the advantages of capital and ſkill. Comparatively free from taxes as France is, and low as is the price of her labour, conſiderably leſs than the capital employed *here*, will *there* ſuffice for the ſame operations. Nor is France in want of money, though her wealth has not hitherto been generally applied to the promotion of her national induſtry, from the prejudices of her nobility, who looked on all trades as diſhonourable; prejudices, however, which are daily vaniſhing before the examples of the king and the princes of the blood, who are actual partners in manufactories of various kinds. The

The principal deficiency of France is undoubtedly in ſkill. But in this our rivals are making a rapid progreſs every hour. And here your committee cannot but refer the Chamber to their own apprehenſions at the time of the Iriſh propoſitions, "from the vigorous efforts made by other European nations, both openly and ſurreptitiouſly, to tranſplant the Britiſh manufactures into their reſpective dominions," which apprehenſions this Chamber is conſcious, were chiefly excited by France. An evidence on the petition to the Lords, againſt emigration, ſtated, "that ten workmen in glaſs had been ſeduced into France, four of them in the latter end of laſt year; and that ſince thoſe workmen had left us, the French had made a very conſiderable progreſs in this manufacture at Sêve:" And, "another evidence, a currier and leather-cutter, ſtated, that ſeveral journeymen in that buſineſs had gone over to France, and that a great manufactory is carried on in Normandy." As to cottons, a member of this committee affirmed to the Houſe of Commons, that from the rivalſhip of the French, his manufacture had ſuffered very conſiderably; and that "a reſpectable friend of his had been offered his own terms, if he would ſettle at Rouen, or in that neighbourhood." And the proficiency of the French in this branch,

was confirmed by another reſpectable gentleman, who being aſked whether the French had not tried to eſtabliſh the cotton manufacture in their country, replied, "That they not only had tried, but were increaſing that manufacture very faſt." The ſame too was aſſerted by another reſpectable member of this Chamber, who, in addition, produced to the Houſe *a ſpecimen of French manufacture*. In the article of fine woollens it is notorious, that the French have long ſince beaten us out of all the ſouthern markets. They have alſo brought their coarſe woollens to very high perfection, and are daily improving their wool, by amending their mode of managing their ſheep. They have a large manufactory of hoſiery at Moulins, under Mr. Jacqueſon, who traces his deſcent from England. He works in all the Nottingham branches, and ſays, that he has made many important improvements, which, about two months ſince, he went to lay before the Miniſter and the King at Fontainbleau. And finally, in reference to the iron trade, your committee beg leave to repeat the information given by a member of this committee, who aſſerts, that there are ſeveral manufactories of iron eſtabliſhed in Burgundy.

It is to our machines, preſſes, dyes, and tools, that we are indebted for preſent ſuperiority. "In proportion as theſe are ex-

ported and copied in foreign countries (ſaid a reſpectable member in his evidence before the Lords) in that proportion our exports of manufactured goods to theſe countries muſt decreaſe, and (as he afterwards adds) the ultimate ruin of many of the Britiſh manufactures muſt follow." In their laſt report your committee ſtated certain doubts on this ſubject, which had been entered on their books, but did not yet appear to have been ſatisfied. They will now offer ſome remarks on the ſituation of the Britiſh manufacturers, ſuppoſing that the ſubſiſting laws againſt the emigration of our artiſans, and the exportation of our tools, ſhall not be formally repealed.

By the treaty a mode is opened, and now expreſsly to be legaliſed, in which all our manufacturing ſkill may be conveyed away. A French manufacturer on a ſmall capital, ſupplied by Government, may come hither with his workmen, ſet up his trade, by large wages draw to him two or three of the beſt workmen of this country, mix them with his own, till the latter have acquired all the manual practices and ſecrets of the former; and if he cannot ſeduce our men to accompany him, he may at leaſt return unmoleſted with his own.

The law againſt aliens, it is true, has not for a long time been enforced, becauſe it would

would have been bad policy to prevent the influx of real capital, and real induſtry; but it *might*, and your committee cannot doubt but it *would* have been occaſionally exerted, if any ſuch ſiniſter practices had been attempted. By the preſent treaty, every check of every kind is totally removed.

After this detail of facts and reaſonings, your committee have only to add, on this third reſolution, that they do not find in the treaty, that which the Chamber unanimouſly reſolved to be expedient; there is no ſtipulation or proviſion which, in the opinion of your committee, can ſecure to our manufactures any permanent advantages.

Reſolutions, February 17th, 1787.

Reſolved unanimouſly, I. That the Chamber do with great ſatisfaction recollect, and moſt cordially recognize and confirm, the firſt principles upon which the General Chamber of Manufacturers of Great Britain was originally formed, viz. "To watch over their intereſts at large as one AGGREGATE, and to be prepared to furniſh Government, if required, with ſuch IMPARTIAL and *true information*, as they may, from time to time, ſtand in need of, for the protection of the Commerce and Manufactures of the EMPIRE AT LARGE; for the want of which, or by relying

relying upon the *information given by intereſted individuals*, the true intereſt of the WHOLE has been often unavoidably miſtaken." And are fully determined to be guided in their judgment upon the French Treaty, by the ſame juſt and liberal principles.

II. That it having been authentically ſtated by a member of this Chamber, that it had been urged in the Houſe of Commons on Monday laſt, as an inevitable conſequence of the preſent treaty, that the Britiſh market muſt be opened upon terms of a ſimilar reciprocity to the Iriſh trader, and manufacturer; and that no ſatisfactory anſwer having been given by the Miniſter; that the Chamber, perceiving the weight and importance of this conſideration, apprehend from his ſilence, that it is intended to renew the Iriſh Propoſitions when the preſent treaty ſhall be confirmed.

III. That the Chamber have received and examined the report of their committee, appointed to enquire how far the preſent treaty with France be conſtructed on ſuch principles as had been previouſly approved by the Chamber, on the 10th of February, and do entirely admit the facts, and concur in the reaſoning advanced in it, ſo far as it extends.

IV. That the Chamber are more than ever convinced, from a reflection on the important

ſuggeſtions

ſuggeſtions thrown out in the ſad report, of the indiſpenſable neceſſity which exiſts for deep conſideration, and all reaſonable delay in this great ſubject, previous to a deciſion that may prove eſſentially injurious to all the commercial intereſts of this country.

V. That the Chamber are determined to perſevere in reſpectful applications to Parliament, whenever they ſhall be neceſſary, without being awed or repreſſed by any ſarcaſms thrown upon their proceedings, or reflections on their conduct, come they from what quarter they may.

VI. That the thanks of the Chamber be given to Mr. Alderman Newnham, for his politeneſs and attention in preſenting their petition to Parliament, and for the zeal and ability ſhewn by him in the ſupport of it.

JOSIAH WEDGWOOD, CHAIRMAN.

Proceedings of a General Meeting held March 27, 1787; Tho. Walker, Eſq. in the Chair.

The concluſion of the report of the Committee on the reſolutions of the 10th of February, was examined and received. The following is a copy of it:—

THE enquiries of your committee under the fourth reſolution, viz. ["That the duties under

under which the manufactures forming ſuch balance ſhould be admitted, ought to be lower than the duties on the ſame articles from all other foreign countries; and ſo low as effectually to favour their conſumption, even againſt the home manufactures of the ſame kind; otherwiſe the fair equality is perpetually liable to be deſtroyed,"] naturally reſolve themſelves into two points—whether by the tariff the Britiſh manufactures, from whence *alone* our gain is to ariſe, are ſecured in poſſeſſion of the French market againſt all other foreign competitors; and whether they are ſo ſecured as always to enſure to us the ſame advantages againſt their own manufactures of ſimilar articles?

On the former of theſe points your committee will content themſelves with examining the duties on the very firſt article of the tariff, which can be imported into France from this country—the article of beer.

Your committee find that from any other foreign country but England, on entering the provinces of the Five Great Farms, beer only pays by the Paris ton of 216 Engliſh gallons —4 *liv.* 16*s.*

On this duty there are 10 five per cents.—2 *liv.* 8*s.*

Paſſing from the provinces of the *aids* to the provinces exempted from the *aids*, and

and the reverſe, it pays a ſubvention duty of 4 *liv.* 1*s.*

Ten 5 per cents. on this—2 *liv.* 6*d.*

Gauge duty on the ſubvention duty—1 *liv.* 7*s.*

Ten 5 per cents. on this—13*s.* 6*d.*

Total—15 *liv.* 6*s.*

In Engliſh money the Paris ton pays altogether 12*s.* 9*d.*

If the beer is deſigned for Lyons, or enters the kingdom of Languedoc or Provence; or if it paſſes in whatever manner into Dauphine, it pays alſo the local duty of the Douane of Lyons at the rate of 15 ſols for every ance; (a meaſure containing about one ninth of a ton) this makes per ton—6 *liv.* 15*s.*

Two 5 per cents. on this—13*s.* 6*d.*

Total—7 *liv.* 8*s.* 6*d.*

Douane of Lyons per ton in Engliſh money, —6*s.* 2¼*d.*

If the beer paſſes through Dauphine, it is alſo ſubject to the *Douane of Valence* of 12 ſols the ance of three barrels, of which barrels there are eight to the ton, this makes by the ton— 1 *liv.* 12*s.*

In Engliſh money—1*s.* 4*d.*

Engliſh Beer may be eſtimated at rather more than 1*s.* per gallon, if we average the value of ſtrong beer, ale, and porter. A Paris ton therefore will be worth fairly about 216 ſhillings, or £10. 16*s.*

The

The value of the caſks is ſtated by the brewers in their evidence before the Privy Council on the Iriſh Propoſitions, to be about 33$\frac{1}{3}$*d.* per cent. ſay 33 per cent. on which the *ad valorem* duty muſt be paid, as well as on the liquor. The caſks then will be an addition of about 70*s.* 9*d.*—£3. 10*s.* 9*d.*

Or, this added together will make £14. 6*s.* 9*d.*

And on this ſum the duty to be paid at 30 per cent. will amount to 86*s.* and a fraction, or to £4. 6*s.*

While foreign beer imported into France from any other country may pay only 12*s.* 9*d.*

And at moſt can only pay £1. 3*d.*$\frac{1}{2}$.

It is demonſtrable, therefore, from theſe calculations, which are taken from undoubted authorities, that the duties on Engliſh beer entering France will exceed thoſe on the beer of any other country by *three hundred per cent.* And even this heavy diſproportion will be yet highly aggravated by the addition of the countervailing duties, which France has reſerved the right of laying: but which your committee have not ſufficient information to eſtimate with preciſion. It is unneceſſary to remark, that there is no natural cauſe, why any foreign country ſhould not be able to rival the breweries of England.

An attention to brevity will not permit your committee to examine all the articles in the ſame manner: they will, however, make

make ſome ſhort obſervations on one or two more.

Linens from Great Britain admitted into France pay the ſame duties as Flemiſh or Dutch linens now pay in England, that is by the ell 1*s.* 3*d.* 4-20*ths*. and a fraction; or on the piece of 15 ells, 18*s.* 6*d.* They will alſo be ſubject to the duties on circulation, after they ſhall once have reached their place of deſtination, if they are then moved acroſs the boundaries of the Five Great Farms.

Foreign linens in general on the piece of 15 French ells pay only 8 *liv.* Ten 5 per cents. on this—4 *liv.*

In Engliſh money, altogether, 10*s.*

And Swiſs linens pay only half this, or 5*s.*

Beſides the latter are exempted from all duties on circulation, this will effectually exclude Britiſh linens from France; and how far it will operate againſt the ſtaple manufacture of Ireland, your committee truſt the manufacturers of that kingdom *will ſeriouſly* conſider——

The fineſt kind of EARTHEN WARE pays in France by the hundred weight—20 *liv.*

Ten 5 per cents. on this is—10 *liv.*

In Engliſh money altogether, for every hundred weight ſterling—£1. 5*s.*

The coarſe kind of *pottery* pays an uniform duty, by the hundred weight, of—2 *liv.* 10*s.*

Ten 5 per cents. on this—1 *liv.* 5*s.*

Altogether in Engliſh money—3*s.* 1*d.*½.

Your

Your committee are ſorry that they had not an opportunity of learning from the Preſident what may be the amount of the 12 per cent. *ad valorem* duty by the tariff on 100lb. weight of the finer and coarſer ſorts of earthen ware and pottery. They have reaſon, however, to believe, from ſuch knowledge as they could collect, that the difference of duties on the goods of foreign potters, when they enter France, muſt be ſome *hundreds* per cent. to the diſadvantage of this nation in all ornamental articles.

On the ſecond point, whether we are ſecured in the French market againſt the French manufactures; your committee will only obſerve, that the reciprocal duties are ſo high as to be virtual prohibitions, whenever there ſhall be any thing like an equality of ſkill. Our manufactures are liable alſo to be unequally burthened by various internal regulations, which your committee will more fully conſider under the ſixth reſolution.

The poſition of the fifth reſolution, "That our own home market ought to be ſecured by unequally high duties on thoſe manufactures which form the balance on our ſide," is a principle palpably diſregarded throughout the treaty;—ſince, as your committee have before remarked, and as the moſt inattentive reader will perceive, all the duties of the tariff, except thoſe on the products

products of France, are nicely reciprocal. Theſe duties, however, will not act as virtual prohibitions in our favour, in the ſame deciſive manner as they will protect the French manufacture, ſuppoſing the ſkill of the two nations to be hereafter equal; becauſe the other advantages which our rivals would enjoy in the cheapneſs of labour, and comparative immunity from taxes, and other circumſtances before mentioned, would, in moſt caſes, more than counterpoiſe the import duties of the tariff; in the leather trade eſpecially, the exciſe duty on the dreſſed material has been computed to be equal to the *ad valorem* duty of 15 per cent. And this exciſe is not to be countervailed. Your committee, therefore, have no doubt, that from the gradual proficiency of France in manufacturing ſkill, "It may, in a little time, happen that the advantages which were at firſt balanced againſt each other, may all ſhift to one ſide."

Under the ſixth and laſt reſolution, your committee have endeavoured to learn as accurately as they could, what internal regulations ſtill remain in France; partially favourable to their own, and oppreſſive to foreign manufactures: for in our own country no ſuch regulations do, or from the nature of our conſtitution can exiſt. And here your committee proceeded with the more caution; becauſe they have been in-

formed by one of their Members, that a perſon of very high authority publicly aſſerted, on a recent occaſion, that no ſuch regulations exiſt in France, more than in our own iſland. The miniſter is reported to have ſaid, that the duties on circulation were in the nature of a toll, and were equally levied on all ſimilar goods of whatever origin, and the ſame information was delivered to the committee by a member of the Chamber from the Lords of Trade. Your committee, therefore, think it their duty to repreſent on what authority they preſume to ſtate the contrary; and that is, a French Book of Rates, called *Recueil Alphabetique des Droits de Traites*, publiſhed at Avignon in 1786, and, as it is generally underſtood in Paris, under ſanction of the Farmer's-General themſelves: A work from which your committee have derived conſiderable aſſiſtance, as to the French duties, which they have already had occaſion to notice in this report.

The firſt partial regulation of this kind, reſpects the duties on goods *returned* to France from foreign countries to which they may have been exported, or from the effectively foreign provinces of Alſace, Lorraine, and the three biſhopricks as well as the free ports of Dunkirk, St. Jean de Luz, Bayonne, L'Orient and Marſeilles. That is to ſay, on

on all their own goods, which have a mark diſtinguiſhing them to be of the national fabricks, they exact only a moderated duty of *one per cent. ad valorem*, while all other goods pay the full duties of the reſpective tariffs, by which the different cuſtom-houſes of France are regulated.

With reſpect to internal circulation, the privileges of the ſeveral manufactures, and even of the ſeveral manufactures of the ſame articles conſiderably differ. Your committee cannot undertake to point them all out, becauſe they lie diſperſed over three thick volumes of the French publication above mentioned; but they will ſtate ſuch, as they think amply ſufficient to excite the alarm and jealouſy of the manufacturers of Great Britain.

All cotton, plain, or woven with dyed yarn, if of the national fabrick, circulate duty free throughout the realm. All cottons of foreign fabrick were entirely prohibited by the edict of July the 10th, 1785; that prohibition is now taken off as far as relates to England, and we are conſequently to be on the footing of other nations before that edict. Our cottons, therefore, muſt be ſubject to the duties on circulation, eſtabliſhed before the 10th of July, 1785.

Woollens at the *Douane* of *Valence*, if of the

the national fabrick, pay, by the 100lb. weight only—2 *liv.* 6*s.* 8*d.*

Where the ſame articles of foreign manufacture pay—6 *liv.* 4*s.* 3*d.*

Difference in favour of their own—3 *liv.* 17*s.* 7*d.*

Or more than 150 per cent.

The ſame diſtinction too is made at the *Douane of Lyons* in favour of their national woollens; and the manufactures of Sedan have the privilege of paſſing to and *from Lyons* duty free, or *to* any place in the realm.

All linens of France (and even of Switzerland) circulate freely all over France. After having arrived at their firſt deſtination, all linens of Great Britain and Ireland cannot circulate without paying the full duties.

In like manner, *gauzes* of their own national manufactories have, by a deciſion of council, been declared to be free of all duties on circulation; while our fabrics of this kind muſt pay the full entries.

With reſpect to the *iron trade*.—The forges of Mr. Chauſſade, which now belong to the King, have peculiar privileges. All anchors and grappling irons from thoſe forges circulate freely after paying the ſmall duty of 1d. per 100lb. weight, and *nails* and *hardware* of all kinds pay only the moderate duty of 4d. the 100lb. with 10 five per cents thereon. Kitchen

utenſils too of hammered *iron* from the forges and furnaces of Morlaix, Pont-ſur-ſaulx, Herouville, Pennemaire, and Couſance, in the diſtrict of Bar, enjoy the privilege of paying only three fourths of the ſtamps duty on iron, wherever that is due. On the other hand, our hardwares muſt pay the full duties every time they paſs the Bureaux after their firſt entry.

Your committee muſt alſo remark, that many manufactories have their bar and pig iron, and their ſteel, either duty free or at very moderate duties.

It muſt alſo be obſerved, that many manufactures, which have no advantages in reſpect of *internal circulation* are *exported*, duty free to foreign countries, and to the effectively foreign provinces and free ports of France, while our goods of the ſame ſort, ſent from any interior part of France, would pay heavy duties.

Your committee find on your books, that being aſked by ſome members of this Chamber, whether our trade with France was to be limited to certain ports, the Lords of the committee of council replied, "That ſome limitation would probably take place; but it would be rendered as convenient as poſſible." A convention has ſince been concluded; but no mention whatever is made of this ſubject.——Your committee, therefore, muſt

muſt acquaint the Chamber, that by the ſubſiſting laws of France, (and all laws reſpecting trade and navigation are to remain in full force, where they are not *expreſsly* abrogated by virtue of the preſent treaty,) two kinds of foreign manufactures, namely, woollens and cottons, are to be imported only by Calais and St. Valery, whence they are to be ſent to Paris, where they muſt be inſpected before they can be forwarded to the place whither they may be addreſſed.——This limitation the committee apprehend, the French have a right to enforce, as it is neither done away by the treaty or the convention, and how burthenſome ſuch a regulation muſt be, your committee need not explain.

Theſe inſtances, which might be conſiderably multiplied, if the very extenſive nature of the ſubject would permit your committee to enter into it at large, are ſufficient to warrant the aſſertion that internal regulations *do exiſt* in France, partially favourable to their own, and oppreſſive to foreign manufactures; and conſequently that no fair equality can exiſt. Your committee too muſt add, that it is not only the preſent exiſtence of the duties, but the poſſible augmentation of them in future, or the extenſion of immunity to their own fabricks, that appears truly formidable to the ſucceſs of our competition under the preſent treaty.

Since the time that the preſent report was begun, a ſolemn convention of perſons, illuſtrious by birth, or high in office, called the *Notables* of France, has been called together at Paris, The object of this great national aſſembly, is a reform of ancient abuſes in the revenue ſyſtem of the country. Your committee muſt obſerve, that we are not very accurately informed what has yet been done, or what is to be done by them. This only we know from official authority, that the *Taille* upon induſtry has been already repealed; the general *Taille* has been reduced *one-tenth*; and the "ſuppreſſion of ſeveral duties prejudicial to induſtry, or too liable to cauſe vexations," is yet further promiſed. Nor can your committee think it out of place to inſert here the recital, which Mr. Calonne makes, of the other meaſures lately taken by the Moſt Chriſtian King for the protection and extenſion of trade.

"He has ſuppreſſed (ſays Mr. Calonne,) ſeveral duties detrimental to commerce, and the ſacrifice which he has thought proper to make of their produce, by favouring the exportation of our commodities, is become a new ſource of wealth.

"*His Majeſty has created, ſupported and animated various branches of induſtry*, which *at preſent ſupply the kingdom with a great*

number of articles, that were FORMERLY IMPORTED FROM ABROAD.

" Several eſtabliſhments of great conſequence have been added, and received ſignal marks of a vigilant protection. Such, amongſt others, are the *iron works* at Mount Cenis, the moſt conſiderable of their kind that exiſt; and that of the whale fiſhery, which originated under the moſt favourable auſpices, at the ſame time, that all the other fiſheries of the kingdom are encouraged, *and whilſt they proſper, are preparing for the* MARINE, A NURSERY OF SEAMEN."

There are, however, ſome points of reform, to be ſubmitted to the *Notables*, which may be thought to affect certain of the preceding arguments of your committee; namely, " the projected arrangements in France, for the freedom of internal circulation; the removal of the Cuſtom-houſes to the frontiers; and the eſtabliſhment of an uniform tariff, combined with the intereſts of commerce."

But to this your committee have to anſwer, that no reaſoning relative to theſe points, can proceed on any ſure ground, till we know the preciſe extent of the reform; and we have no right to expect from ſuch a rival, any alterations more favourable than the ſyſtem which at preſent exiſts. The uncertainty of the new regulations which are to be propoſed

poſed ſeems to your committee to be an irreſiſtible motive, why the manufacturers of Great Britain ſhould yet further think, before they decide, and the legiſlature pauſe, before they carry into effect the pending treaty. As to the duties on circulation in particular; your committee cannot but remark, that the ſame meaſures, which ſhall remove the inequalities ſtated above, muſt alſo generally let the manufacturers of the moſt induſtrious provinces of France, where labour and living alſo are loweſt, into the great markets of that kingdom, exonerated from the burthens under which they have hitherto ſtruggled in their competition with foreigners.

Your committee cannot diſmiſs this enquiry without adding, that whatever inequality of duties may at preſent exiſt to the diſadvantage of the Engliſh manufacturer in his competition with the French, and with other foreign manufacturers in the markets of France; this inequality will yet be materially augmented *in the ſhort ſpace of four years*. All the French duties in this report, (excepting the duties on Engliſh goods under the tariff,) are computed with *ten* five per cents. on the original ſum; but *two* of theſe five per cents. or *one fifteenth* of the whole duties, as they are here calculated, will expire with the year 1790. On the other ſide, the duties of the tariff are "fixed invariably" for the duration of the treaty. Theſe

Theſe facts and reaſonings contain all that your committee have to offer under the heads referred *to them* by the Chamber. They cannot, however, forbear to repeat, that many very important conſiderations ariſe from the wide entrance, which will be opened by the treaty, to many old, and ſome new branches of clandeſtine importation; eſpecially of ſilk, hoſiery, ribbons, and other manufactures of the ſame material.

Your committee alſo beg leave to call the ſerious attention of the Chamber, to an interpretation of the treaty, which (as your committee are credibly told) was given to the Houſe of Commons by the miniſter himſelf, namely, that the reciprocal duties of the tariff are to be the terms of commercial intercourſe as well between France and Ireland, as between France and Great Britain. On the queſtion of the Iriſh Propoſitions, it was the unanimous and ſettled opinion of the Manufacturers of Great Britain, that 10½ per cent. *ad valorem* (together with countervailing duties) would not be ſufficient to protect our home markets againſt the manufacturers of Ireland; how then are we to ſtand the competition againſt them in the markets of France, where the ſimilar commodities of the two ſiſter kingdoms are to be equally burthened with the ſame duties on importation? nor muſt it be forgotten that Ireland, treating

treating France at this moment like other nations, will give little or nothing in return; the equivalent to France can only be found in the opening of the Britiſh market to the productions and induſtry of her ancient rival; while Ireland bids fair to enjoy much the greater part, if not all, of the emoluments to be gained in the French market; nor is this the only danger which appears to threaten us from this new explanation of the tariff—an explanation, which (we cannot but notice) was refuſed by the Privy Council to ſeveral members of this committee. It was ſworn by the manufacturers before the Houſe of Lords in 1785; that in many caſes 15, 20, 30, nay 50 per cent. with countervailing duties, would not keep out the manufactures of Ireland; but under cover of the preſent treaty, Iriſh goods may be eaſily ſmuggled into this country, as French commodities, at the duties of the tariff, with only the additional expence of touching, and procuring the neceſſary papers, at Dunkirk, or ſome other French port; and if this traffic be carried on in French veſſels there can be little difficulty, and as little coſt, in the practice of this fraud; which at the ſame time could not ſuffer any very eſſential check from any regulations which the legiſlature may make in our ſyſtem of revenue.

On theſe points your committee ſhould not be

be unwilling to enter into ſome detail; but they think themſelves not warranted by their inſtructions ſo to digreſs. Should they be directed by a general meeting, they would chearfully reſume their enquiries. In the mean time they muſt take the liberty of repeating their recommendation of theſe ſubjects to the anxious diſcuſſion of the Chamber, as they are indiſpenſable to the proper underſtanding of the preſent queſtion, and yet more particularly indiſpenſable to the juſt preſervation of that which it is hoped the Chamber will ever be jealouſly ſolicitous to guard, their own conſiſtency and honour.

THOMAS WALKER, Chairman.

Reſolutions, March 27, 1787.

RESOLVED unanimouſly, That the various reports of the committee upon the ſubject of the French treaty, from the 9th of February incluſive, be ſent to the members of the Chamber.

That every degree of additional information which can be obtained, ſhall alſo be ſent to the members, in order to enable them to form their judgments, calmly and deliberately, on the great queſtion of the French treaty, previous to any deciſion of this Chamber.

THOMAS WALKER, Chairman.

The

The YORKSHIRE QUESTION, *or* PETITION, *or* ADDRESS: *(Being a ſhort and fair ſtate of the Caſe, upon the Principles, the Views, the Means, and the Objects of both Parties as confeſſed by themſelves.) Moſt earneſtly and ſeriouſly addreſſed to the* CONSIDERATION *of the* PEOPLE *of* ENGLAND, *aſſembled in their ſeveral County, City, and other Meetings.*

IN all public diſcuſſion, upon public affairs, it has been uſual to gueſs at the views and objects of thoſe who propoſe any meaſure, and of thoſe who oppoſe it; and to ſtate their intentions, as arguments for or againſt the meaſure itſelf. It very ſeldom indeed happens, that either party acknowledge their intentions to be what their adverſary imputes to them. Hence much difficulty of judging between the competitors for public truſt and confidence ariſes to the people, who are firſt diverted from an examination of the meaſure adviſed, to the probable intentions of the adviſer or oppoſer, and then, a greater difficulty attends the fixing with certainty, what that intention is; neither party, as has been remarked, confeſſing the motive to be that, which is ſuggeſted by his opponent.

Much benefit is expected, and it is hoped that much. indeed will be derived, from

the petition of the county of York—from the effect of the reſolutions there entered into—and from the watchful, prudent, and well-directed labours of the very reſpectable committee of that great county. This for the future.—[*A copy of the Petition, and the names of the Committee, are annexed.*]

But a very great and diffuſive good has already flowed from it. In that meeting, the contending parties have fairly owned their principles; avowed their intentions, and preciſely marked their objects. All conjecture as to motives; all inference from the oſtenſible end to the occult deſign; every argument from preſumeable or probable intention being thus done away—the parties come fairly with their meaſures, and their means before the people, now to be aſſembled in the ſeveral towns, cities and counties of this kingdom; and thus, that people are enabled to judge with certainty, and to chuſe for themſelves, without the leaſt dread of being deceived in the nature of the object, or the quality of the means, by which that object is to be obtained.

At the Yorkſhire meeting two opinions were given—very different indeed; and two meaſures propoſed—abſolutely contradictory to each other. Each, however, had its advocates and ſupporters. All other than a numerical compariſon of theſe ſhall be here

here abſtained from. That indeed was remarkable; for one party was ſo ſmall as not to give their meaſures and doctrines the ſupport or countenance of their own vote. The propoſitions of the other were carried without a diſſenting voice. The firſt of theſe *call themſelves* the KING'S FRIENDS. The other party was compoſed of the GENTLEMEN and FREE-HOLDERS of the county; and each, by their ſpokeſmen, clearly and diſtinctly avowed their object, and recommended the means by which they propoſed to attain it. Let theſe be ſtated; and let the COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, for this time, have the precedence.

The COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, then, by the mouths of *Mr. Wyvill*, *Mr. Pritchard*, *Mr. Hill*, *Sir George Savile*, *Mr. Stanhope*, *Mr. Turner*, and ſeveral others, repreſented the corrupt dependence of Parliament as the grand cauſe of all our misfortunes; from which dependence and corruption, they inſiſted, flowed the moſt improvident and laviſh grants of the money of the ſubject, ſqueezed from them by the moſt oppreſſive taxes; and charged the miſapplication, and profuſe ſquandering of that money, as owing to the neglect, or refuſal of Parliament to examine, or, in any wiſe, controul the expenditure. They repreſented the undue, already prodigious, and ſtill encreaſing influence

ence of the Crown, as the grand corrupter of Parliament: they ſtated the variety and magnitude of places and emoluments in its gift and diſpoſal, as the means employed for that corruption; and they charged, that the public money was laviſhly applied to continue and forward the very corruption from which it flowed. Theſe were the *evils* and their *cauſes* as repreſented and alledged by the COUNTRY GENTLEMEN.

To remedy theſe was their object. The means propoſed by them to attain that object were, to bring the influence of the Crown within ſome reaſonable bounds; and, by removing ſome of the moſt apparent and obvious cauſes of the corruption of Parliament, to reſtore that body to ſuch a ſtate of purity and health, as might enable it to diſcharge its function; and diſpoſe it to grant the money of the ſubject with ſome degree of caution; and to controul the expenditure with, at leaſt, ſome degree of care.

Thus far the COUNTRY GENTLEMEN; and to them ſucceeded the——KING's FRIENDS.

The KINGS's FRIENDS, then, by the mouth of Mr. Smelt,——but here it may not be amiſs to make thoſe who are not yet informed, acquainted with Mr. Smelt; his *ſituation* and *connections*.

Mr.

Mr. Smelt is a gentleman of the county of York of decent fortune, and of a family ſufficiently reputable. In himſelf, in his private life, not only unexceptionable, but reſpectable. About eight years ſince, this gentleman was appointed Sub-Governor to the Prince of Wales, in which office he continued ſome years; during which time his Majeſty paid him moſt particular regard and attention. So highly was he in the royal favour, that, when the King diſcharged Dr. Markham (now Archbiſhop of York) and the late Lord Holderneſſe, together with an Oxford ſcholar, whoſe name does not occur, from the government and education of the Prince, he earneſtly preſſed Mr. Smelt to remain. From what motive is not well known, but he declined the offer, and even refuſed, though much preſſed, to retain the ſalary. His Majeſty's favour and approbation, ſo far from ceaſing, has every day encreaſed. He has again been called to the King's preſence, and there is not a man in the kingdom, who enjoys ſo much of the *apparent* confidence of the King at this day; and certainly there is not a man of any rank or condition in the country, who was ever honoured with ſo much of the private ſociety, and familiar intercourſe with his Majeſty, as Mr. Smelt is at this very time. This account of Mr. Smelt is intended to impreſs on the people

people the *great authority* with which he ſpoke; the *certain knowledge* which he had, from long intercourſe of his Majeſty's *gracious diſpoſitions*, and *princely deſires*; and the habitudes of *thinking*, *reaſoning* and *wiſhing*, in which he muſt have been *quite familiar* at the Queen's Houſe, in which his Majeſty reſides, and where the King's friends muſt of courſe reſort and conſult.

From the *boſom* of *theſe*,——from the very *interior* of the King *himſelf*, Mr. Smelt iſſues to the Yorkſhire meeting, and becomes the mouth of *that party*.

Mr. Smelt then affirmed, that all our misfortunes aroſe from the King's *not* having more *power* and *influence* than he has. As a remedy, therefore, he recommended that the *power* and *influence* of the King ſhould be encreaſed. The firſt, he plainly aſſerted; the ſecond, he directly recommended. The immediate benefits, which he expected from that increaſe of power and influence, he did not ſtate in words equally preciſe. But it was impoſſible to *miſtake* him. To remove even every poſſible inſinuation of unfair conſtruction, the people of England are deſired to attend to his words, which ſhall be fairly quoted. The people will interpret for themſelves. Theſe are his words;———

"The *power* of the crown is by *no means*

"*exorbitant*;

" *exorbitant*; on the *contrary*, it wants *greatly* " to be *increaſed*; the King's *influence* is *too* " *little*; his hands want to be *ſtrengthened*, for " he is *not able* to curb the licentiouſneſs with " which he is every day *talked* of in *every* " *company*, and *every ſtreet*, nor *even* to re- " ſtrain the inſertion of a *newſpaper para-* " *graph*." In a preceding part of his ſpeech he ſaid—" The ground of the petition ſeemed " to be, to *curb* the *influence* of the crown, " and to prevent the Sovereign from *diſpoſing* " of the revenues granted to him by Parlia- " ment."—It *is hardly* neceſſary to add, that he ended by a moſt earneſt entreaty to the meeting to reject the petition. For the fur- ther ſatisfaction of the reader, Mr. Smelt's ſpeech is annexed to this addreſs.

After theſe expreſſions, thus fairly tranſ- cribed from his ſpeech, it cannot be unfair to obſerve that—to lament an inability to do any particular thing, is to aſſert that ſuch particular thing ſhould be done, were the power equal to its performance; and that in no form of government whatſoever can any action be reſtrained, but by the terror of the puniſhment annexed to its commiſſion. Theſe remarks cannot be ſo much as cavilled at; to deny their truth, is impoſſible.

Under the authority, then, of theſe remarks (without enquiring what company Mr. Smelt keeps, in which the King is *conſtantly*

and

and *licentiouſly reviled)* the immediate *benefits* which Mr. Smelt propoſed from the deſired increaſe of the King's power and influence, are——

Firſt, That his Majeſty would regulate all "*private*, *friendly* and *convivial* ſociety at his "pleaſure; and either repreſs the freedom of "converſation intirely, or puniſh it, when it "tranſgreſſed ſuch limits as he may be pleaſed "to aſſign it." This is the unavoidable inference from Mr. Smelt's complaint, that the King is abuſed in every company, and every ſtreet, for want, as he aſſerts, of *ſufficient* power and influence. It was ridiculous to complain of want of power, if it was not intended to uſe the power when got, to remedy the evil; and there is no poſſible remedy for this evil, "*talking* licentiouſly of "the King in every company," but by uſing the deſired power for the regulation of *private companies*; and ſuppreſſing the freedom, or puniſhing the inadvertencies of *private*, *family*, *friendly*, and *convivial* converſation. Another advantage would ariſe, indiſpenſably neceſſary to the exerciſe of this power, and inſeparable from it, which it is odd that Mr. Smelt ſhould paſs over in ſilence—the employment of SPIES! The neceſſity of an whole hoſt of theſe honourable officers is ſelf-evident. How otherwiſe is it poſſible to bring the private diſcourſe of families and friends into

judgment before the magiſtrate, and to puniſh thoſe who have tranſgreſſed? Without the aid of ſome ſuch, even now, how could Mr. Smelt know that the King was evilly ſpoken of, in other companies than thoſe which he he himſelf keeps; it muſt be through the miniſtry of ſpies that Mr. Smelt has been able to aſſure us that the King is reviled in *every company*.

Second benefit. "That his Majeſty would "prohibit all diſcuſſion of public affairs, and "political controverſy *in print*, even to the "inſertion of a *ſingle paragraph in a news-* "*paper*, or puniſh ſeverely thoſe who ſhall "tranſgreſs."——The ſame reaſoning which aroſe from the firſt benefit is applicable to this ſecond; as, without a *licenſer* of the *preſs*, that is, without making it criminal by the King's authority, to publiſh any thing in print, to convey the ſmalleſt information; or lay any fact, or ſubmit any reaſoning to the people through the preſs, without the *King's licence firſt had* and *obtained*; and inflicting heavy puniſhments on thoſe who preſumed to do otherwiſe;—without this, it is *impoſſible* to deviſe any method by which the King ſhall be enabled to ſuppreſs, or prevent the inſertion of ſuch paragraphs as he may diſlike, in a news-paper.

Third benefit. "That, by ſuch increaſe "of power, the King would be enabled to

"diſpoſe

" diſpoſe of the revenues, granted to him by " Parliament, according to his *will and pleaſure*, " without controul, and without account." This is the obvious and unavoidable ſenſe of the ſpeech! Mr. Smelt bitterly lamented that the petition tended to defeat this power. Let the following expreſſions taken from his ſpeech be conſidered, and not even a ſhadow of doubt can remain: " The petition tends, ſaid he, " to prevent the Sovereign from " *diſpoſing* of the revenues granted him by " Parliament." The petition neither aſks nor implies any ſuch thing. The King now has, and has always had, the diſpoſal of the revenue; the buſineſs and duty of the Parliament was to take care that the Miniſters of the King did not divert it from the objects to which they had deſtined it, and to puniſh them for ſuch malverſation when it happened. This the petition begs the Houſe of Commons to conſider again as their duty and buſineſs, and to *perform* that *duty*. It aſks this, and on that head, it aſks no more. Again, " the petition tended to make the " King no longer a *judge of his own benevo-* " *lence* (with whoſe money pray?) but to " conſtitute parliament his guardians." Surely Mr. Smelt muſt have thought the people of this country ſtrangely altered, if not degenerated, when he hopes to alarm them into an oppoſition to any meaſure by telling them,

that " it tended to make the Parliament the King's Guardians." But, one more of Mr. Smelt's wiſhes laid before them, the people will think for themſelves. Leſt the *benevolence* of the King ſhould be *ſtinted*, when the guardianſhip of the Parliament was ended;—leſt his Majeſty might not have *his* revenues large enough when entirely at *his own diſpoſal*, Mr. Smelt expreſſed a ſtrong deſire " that *all* WAR TAXES and ESTABLISHMENTS ſhould be kept to their *full extent* in times of peace." This indeed was not quite ſo well received in Yorkſhire. The reſt of the kingdom may perhaps *like it better*, eſpecially when they conſider with WHOM Mr. Smelt is in the moſt *confidential intimacy*.

Here, then, O people of England, you have both parties before you, in their own words, with their avowed intentions, with their acknowledged projects; the ends they deſire, and the means by which they propoſe to attain thoſe ends, openly profeſſed. After this, no freeholder, not one of the people, can be at a moment's loſs to decide on the part he ſhall take in the ſeveral county and other meetings, now or ſhortly to be called for the purpoſe of preſenting ſuch a petition as has been voted in Yorkſhire. A ſhort recapitulation will remove all doubts.

Whoever thinks that the *power* and *influence*

ence of the crown is *too little*, and ought to be ENCREASED;——

Whoever wiſhes that the King, ſo encreaſed in power, ſhould regulate all *private companies*, and *puniſh* ſuch *converſation* as *he* does not like;——

Whoever wiſhes and deſires that the *liberty* of the PRESS ſhould be reſtrained; a *licenſer* eſtabliſhed; all *information* to the people, in print, concerning *national* affairs, *ſuppreſſed*; and the inſerting even a *ſingle* paragraph in a news-paper, without the *King's leave*, ſeverely puniſhed;——

Whoever thinks that the Parliament ought to *grant* whatever money the King *aſks*, and wiſhes that the *King* ſhould diſpoſe of his *people's* money ſo *granted*, according to his *will* and *pleaſure*, without controul and without account;——

All thoſe, who thus *think* and *wiſh*, are deſired to attend at their reſpective county, city or other meetings, and there, with the KING'S FRIENDS and Mr. Smelt, ſupport an addreſs to his Majeſty for the attainment of ſuch *deſirable objects*;—But

Whoever thinks that the *influence* of the CROWN is already *too great*, and employed to *corrupt* the parliament;——

Whoever thinks that corrupting the parliament with the *money of the people*, already *granted*, a means to make that parliament *grant more*;—— Who-

Whoever wiſhes to ſee a ſtop put to *unmerited* penſions; an abolition of *uſeleſs* places, and a temperate *reform* of all;——

Whoever wiſhes that parliament, made leſs corrupt, ſhould grant the *people's money* with *caution* and *reluctance*, and ſee it *accounted* for with *rigorous punctuality*;——

All men, who *thus* think and wiſh, will attend at the county or other meetings; and, with the COUNTRY GENTLEMEN, ſupport a PETITION of the *ſame kind* as that reſolved on in the COUNTY of YORK.

The Speech of Mr. SMELT, *lately Sub-Governour to the Prince of Wales, at the Yorkſhire Meeting; carefully taken down at the time.*

MR. SMELT requeſted the indulgence of the meeting, and their candid interpretation of arguments, which his want of ſkill and experience might fail to arrange with judgment, or place in their proper point of view. He ſaid, that as the advertiſement to call the county together was ſigned by many reſpectable names, he came to York with a confident hope, that their intention was to propoſe ſome meaſures for the promotion of the common cauſe, and to unite the

the minds of men in the hour of diſtreſs; but that he lamented to find, that, inſtead of contributing to the ſupport of government, the intention avowed was to divide its ſtrength; for that the ground of the petition ſeemed to be to curb the influence of the Crown, and to prevent the ſovereign from diſpoſing of the revenues granted to him by Parliament; a meaſure by which he apprehended the lateſt poſterity might be ſenſibly affected.

He then deſired to ſhew his own conſiſtency, by a detail of the circumſtances of his life, and related, that he had early engaged in, and after nineteen years' faithful ſervice, retired from a profeſſion, without accepting any reward, or penſion, as an illneſs, not contracted in ſervice, but which had grown up with him from his infancy, had occaſioned his deſire to reſign.

He took occaſion here to reflect on the neglected ſtate of the navy, and weak condition of the works at Plymouth, when he was called on in his official character, to inſpect them in the courſe of the laſt war. During his retirement, of which this city was the ſcene, he affirmed that he had dedicated his time to the ſtudy of our conſtitution, and other national objects; that while in this ſituation he received a call to a moſt important duty, for the faithful

though

inadequate diſcharge of which, while in employment, he was well pleaſed to receive his wages; but that on the concluſion of his attendance upon the Princes, which he reſigned from a ſenſe of his own ability, he had declined the offer of an annuity for the remainder of his life; that he therefore once more retired to his own natural and humble ſituation, whence he was again drawn by the commands of his moſt gracious maſter; that whether the ſtipend he had from that time enjoyed was to be conſtrued into a penſion he could not tell, and was now even indifferent, for that from this moment he reſigned it; "and now," ſaid he, "I am an independent man."

He then reprobated the petition to the Houſe of Commons, as it tended to make the King no longer the judge of his own benevolence, but to conſtitute Parliament his guardians; and declared it even illegal for one branch of the conſtitution to interfere with the operations of another. He affirmed that the power of the Crown was by no means exorbitant; that, on the contrary, it required to be greatly increaſed: that the King's influence was too little, and that his hands wanted to be ſtrengthened; for that he is not able to curb the licentiouſneſs with which he is every day talked of in every company and in every ſtreet, nor even to

reſtrain

reſtrain the inſertion of a news-paper paragraph, while the preſent meaſure tended to anarchy and confuſion, and to ſnatch away that ſacred veil which the conſtitution had wiſely drawn round the Crown, and which only the greateſt occaſion ſhould remove from before the ſplendour of Majeſty. That ſuch was the delicacy of the legiſlature, at the time of the Revolution, that the word *Abdication* was a work of three days' deliberation, their object being to maintain the immortality of the Royal Perſon, a perſon upon which the law had beſtowed not only an exemption from death, but from error; that in this maxim, "the King can do no wrong," the only ſafeguard of the people is contained, and that from his protection alone their liberty is to be derived; he therefore recommended it to thoſe who were in purſuit of liberty, that they ſhould implore the protection of the King, as by protection and ſecurity liberty was to be underſtood.

He now entered on the comparative merits of the preſent adminiſtration, and thoſe who conducted the affairs of the nation on Whig principles, and hence again deduced the property of giving greater power to the crown. He averred that, in the days of Whiggiſm, the miniſter, diſtinct from the crown, formed a fourth branch of legiſlature, which had abſorbed within itſelf the power

and

and office of the crown, and that leaving *de jure* royalty to be poſſeſſed by the Royal Perſon, the party of the miniſter aſſumed and exerciſed the office of King *de facto*. The narrow principles of ſelf, actuated the meaſures and purſuits of Whigs: hence the complaints of our brethren in Ireland have been fomented, and hence the rebellion in America grew to ſo ſtupendous a height, that it was irreſiſtible almoſt at the firſt. Lord Chatham, he granted, was formed to glare a meteor in a ſtorm, but by no means to conduct finances in the time of peace; and declared that the preſent increaſe of debt ariſes from that want of foreſight, which, in peace, never looks forward towards the exigencies of war; adding, that one of the greateſt misfortunes of this country is, that no miniſter is found ſufficiently firm to keep up the taxes on the return of peace to the greateſt height of a war eſtabliſhment: [*Here the whole meeting expreſſed the utmoſt diſapprobation.*] for if that were done, proviſion might be made againſt the day of danger, and we ſhould not, in the hour of preſſing neceſſity, be obliged to purchaſe every requiſite article at the moſt exorbitant prices: and here recurring to the crimination of Whiggiſm, he affirmed, that, if the laſt war had broke out two years after, we ſhould not have had a fleet fit for ſervice.

He

He then directly undertook to exculpate Government from the charge of having occaſioned the calamities complained of, and transferred the blame to the people, whom he called the ſlaves of ſelfiſhneſs, which deſcended even to the election of coroners: to them alone he aſcribed the diſorders of the country. He denied the exiſtence of one patriot. After admitting the poſſible truth of Lord Orford's aſſertion, that all men had their prices, he affirmed that if there be a patriot in this country, he is now upon the throne; "The King is not only the greateſt and the beſt, but he was ſorry to ſay, he believed him to be the only patriot in this country." He called to recollection a former meeting of the county of York, and lamented that the aſſembly preſent could blow both hot and cold in that room; for that nine years ago they conſidered the King as worthy of their reſpect; they then called on him to diſſolve the Parliament, for excluding a man, whoſe private character none would be ſo bold as to vindicate; whereas, on the preſent occaſion, Parliament is to be called on to reſtrain the King; he therefore beſought the meeting, by every obligation that could influence the lover of his country, from every principle of public and private intereſt, from the loyalty and affection due to the moſt gracious prince,

engaged

engaged in a war the moſt juſt that ever was entered into, to reject the petition, and to ſeek for the redreſs of our calamities from means in our own power to carry into effect. Let reformation begin with the body of the people. The principles of electors were corrupt; let them return to virtue, and let them chooſe for repreſentatives diſcreet and diſpaſſionate men; ſuch men as are recommended to their choice by the writ of election. The only ground on which the petition could pretend to propriety, he ſaid, was an opinion that the King is the ſervant of the people; and, now returning to the royal attributes, added, that it is a narrow, a little, and a mean idea; he is not the ſervant of the people, he is their ſoul; he is the ſoul of the conſtitution: from him and him alone, the conſtitution derives its energy; from him alone the operations of the ſtate derive their efficacy: he is the life, the ſoul, the very exiſtence of the conſtitution. And here, recommending once more the rejection of the petition, he profeſſed his readineſs to join in an addreſs to the throne, expreſſive of loyalty, confidence, contribution of ſtrength, and co-operation, &c. &c.

York,

York, December 30, 1779.

AT a very numerous and reſpectable meeting, of the firſt perſons of conſideration and property in this county, held here this day, the following petition and reſolutions were unanimouſly agreed to:

To the Honourable the Commons of Great Britain in Parliament aſſembled:

The Petition of the Gentlemen, Clergy, and Freeholders of the County of York,

Sheweth,

THAT this nation hath been engaged for ſeveral years in a moſt expenſive and unfortunate war; that many of our valuable colonies, having actually declared themſelves independent, have formed a ſtrict confederacy with France and Spain, the dangerous and inveterate enemies of Great Britain; that the conſequence of thoſe combined misfortunes had been a large addition to the national debt, a heavy accumulation of taxes, a rapid decline of the trade, manufactures, and land-rents of the kingdom.

Alarmed at the diminiſhed reſources and growing burthens of this country, and convinced that rigid frugality is now indiſpenſably neceſſary in every department of the State, your petitioners obſerve with grief, that notwithſtanding the calamities and impo-

veriſhed condition of the nation, much public money has been improvidently ſquandered, and that many individuals enjoy ſinecure places, efficient places with exorbitant emoluments, and penſions unmerited by public ſervice, to a large and ſtill encreaſing amount; whence the Crown has acquired a great unconſtitutional influence, which, if not checked, may ſoon prove fatal to the liberties of this country.

Your petitioners conceiving that the true end of every legitimate government is not the emolument of ANY INDIVIDUAL, but the welfare of the commmunity; and conſidering that by the conſtitution of this realm, the national purſe is intruſted in a peculiar manner to the cuſtody of this Honourable Houſe; beg leave further to repreſent that until effectual meaſures be taken to redreſs the oppreſſive grievances herein ſtated, the grant of an additional ſum of public money, beyond the produce of the preſent taxes, will be injurious to the rights and property of the people, and derogatory from the honour and dignity of Parliament.

Your petitioners therefore, appealing to the juſtice of this Honourable Houſe, do moſt earneſtly requeſt, that before any new burthens are laid upon this country, effectual meaſures may be taken by this Houſe to enquire into and correct the groſs abuſes in the expenditure,

expenditure of public money; to reduce all exorbitant emoluments; to reſcind and aboliſh all ſinecure places and unmerited penſions; and to appropriate the produce to the neceſſities of the State in ſuch manner as to the wiſdom of Parliament ſhall ſeem meet.

And your petitioners ſhall ever pray, &c.

After which the following reſolutions were propoſed, and alſo unanimouſly agreed to, viz.

1ſt. Reſolved, that the petition now read to this meeting, addreſſed to the Houſe of Commons, and requeſting that before any new burthens be laid upon the country, effectual meaſures may be taken by that Houſe to enquire into and correct the groſs abuſes in the expenditure of public money: to reduce all exorbitant emoluments; to reſcind and aboliſh all ſinecure places and unmerited penſions; and to appropriate the produce to the neceſſities of the State, is approved by the meeting.

2d. Reſolved, that a committee of ſixty-one gentlemen be appointed to carry on the neceſſary correſpondence for effectually promoting the object of the petition, and to prepare a plan of an aſſociation on legal and conſtitutional grounds, to ſupport the laudable reform, and ſuch other meaſures as may conduce to reſtore the freedom of Parliament.

The

The following gentlemen compoſed the Committee:

Sir. G. Armitage, Mr. Chaloner, Sir R. Hildyard, Mr. Morrit, Rev. Mr. Zouch, Sir. J. Norcliffe, Mr. Strickland of Boynton, Dean of Ripon, Mr. J. S. Smith, Mr. P. Milnes, Mr. Croft, Mr. Bell, Rev. Mr. Wyvil, Mr. Hill, Gen. Hale, Mr. Smith of Heath, Rev. Mr. Maſon, Mr. Tooker, Mr. H. Duncombe, Mr. H. Thompſon, Mr. Croft, jun. Mr. Duncombe, Mr. Dalton, Mr. Strickland of Beverley, Sir William Milner, Mr. Hawkſworth, Mr. Withers, Rev. Mr. Robinſon, Mr. Foljambe, Major Ferrand, Mr. Farrer, Mr. James Milnes, Mr. Law, Mr. Edmunds, Mr. Wilſon, Mr. Jackſon, Rev. F. Dodſworth, Mr. Cradock, Mr. Carver, Rev. Mr. Michell, Sir Watts Horton, Mr. C. St. Quintin, Dr. Dring, Rev. J. Robinſon, Mr. P. Wentworth, Mr. S. A. Ward, Rev. Mr. Cayley, Dean of York, Rev. Mr. Bourn, Rev. Mr. Comber, Mr. Marriott, Mr. G. Elſley, Mr. Pool, Alderman Carr, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Thornton, Rev. Mr. Dealtry, jun. Mr. F. Smyth, Rev. Mr. Eyre, Mr. Baynes, jun. Mr. Garforth, and Mr. Hildyard.

The above meeting was the moſt numerous and reſpectable ever known upon any occaſion, ſince the Revolution.

Caſe

Caſe of LORD HOLLAND.

Copy of a Letter from Lord Holland *to the* Lord Mayor (Samuel Turner) *of* London, *with his Lordſhip's Anſwer thereto.*

To the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor.

MY LORD,

IN a petition preſented by your Lordſhip it is mentioned as a grievance—*Inſtead of puniſhing, conferring honours on a Pay-maſter, the public defaulter of unaccounted millions.* I am told that I am the pay-maſter here cenſured: May I beg to know of your Lordſhip if it is ſo? If it is, I am ſure Mr. Beckford muſt have been againſt it, becauſe he knows, and could have ſhewn your Lordſhip in writing, the utter falſehood of what is there inſinuated.

I have not the honour to know your Lordſhip, ſo I cannot tell what you may have heard to induce you to carry to our Sovereign a complaint of ſo atrocious a nature.

Your Lordſhip by your ſpeech made to the King at delivering the petition, has adopted the contents of it; and I don't know of whom to enquire but of your Lordſhip concerning this injury done to an innocent man, who am by this means (if I am the

perſon meant) hung out as an object of public hatred and reſentment.

You have too much honour and juſtice not to tell me whether I am the perſon meant, and if I am, the grounds upon which I am thus charged, that I may vindicate myſelf, which truth will enable me to do to the conviction of the bittereſt enemy; and therefore I may boldly ſay, to your Lordſhip's entire ſatisfaction, whom I certainly have never offended,

I am, with the greateſt reſpect,
My Lord,
Your Lordſhip's moſt obedient,
And moſt humble ſervant,
HOLLAND.

Holland-Houſe, Kenſington,
July 9, 1769.

The Lord Mayor's *Anſwer.*

THE Lord Mayor preſents his compliments to Lord Holland, and in anſwer to the honour of his Lordſhip's letter delivered to him by Mr. Selwyn, he begs leave to ſay that he had no concern in drawing up the petition from the Livery of London to his Majeſty; that he looks on himſelf only as the carrier, together with other gentlemen charged by the Livery with the delivery of it; that he does not, nor ever did, hold himſelf accountable for the contents of it, and is a ſtranger to the nature of the ſuppoſed charge againſt his Lordſhip.

Manſion-Houſe, July 10, 1769. *From*

From the GAZETTEER, *July* 17, 1769.

We have authority to give the public the following authentic copy of a letter, received yeſterday by a Liveryman of London:——

" DEAR SIR, *Fonthill, July* 15, 1769.

"I AM as much ſurprized as you ſeem to be, at ſeeing my name, and papers in my poſſeſſion, appealed to by a Noble Lord. You and my friends in the city think it incumbent on me to vindicate (as they are pleaſed to expreſs themſelves) my honour and character, which is called in queſtion.—The only proper ſatisfaction in my power to give you, and my other friends, is, to relate plain matters of fact, to the beſt of my recollection.

" In the laſt ſeſſions of Parliament, on a queſtion of revenue, (as far as my memory ſerves,) I did declare to the Houſe, that the public revenue had been ſquandered away, and that the money of the nation had not been regularly audited and accounted for; that in the department of the Pay-Office, I had been informed, there were upwards of forty millions not properly accounted for. That the Officers of the King's Exchequer were bound in duty to ſee juſtice done to the public. That proceſs had iſſued out of the Court of Exchequer, and that all proceedings for a

certain time, had been ſuſpended by the King's ſign manual. I then did declare that it was an high offence for any miniſter to adviſe the King to ſtop the courſe of public juſtice, without aſſigning a very good reaſon for ſuch his advice.—I deſired the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the Lords of the Treaſury, who ſat oppoſite to me, to ſet me right if my information was not well founded; but not a ſingle word was uttered in anſwer, by any of the gentlemen in adminiſtration.

" After ſome days had elapſed, I met my friend Mr. Woodhouſe in Weſtminſter-hall; he told me, I had been miſinformed as to what I had mentioned in the Houſe of Commons; and that, if I would give him leave, he would ſend me a paper from a Noble Lord, which would convince me of my miſtake.—The paper alluded to is in London, I, therefore, cannot ſpeak of the contents with accuracy and preciſion; but this I recollect, that the peruſal of the papers did *not* convince me, that all I had heard was falſe. It was a private paper, and I do not recollect having ſhewn it to more than a ſingle perſon. I have no doubt Mr. Woodhouſe has a copy of the paper by him, and hope he will ſubmit the contents to the judgment of the public, in vindication of an INNOCENT man.

" I am, dear Sir, your ever faithful
" And affectionate humble ſervant,
" WILL. BECKFORD."

From

From the ſame, July 19, 1769.

MUCH having been ſaid upon the ſubject of a Paymaſter's accounts, it is fit that matter ſhould be underſtood; and the public may be aſſured that the following detail is true.

When there is an account to be taken of any debt or debts due to the Crown, a writ of *Diſtringas ad Computandum* iſſues, *ex officio*, out of the Court of Exchequer. In obedience to this proceſs, the Sheriff, where there is a liquidated balance, returns a ſhilling in the pound; but, where there is no liquidated balance, the Sheriff returns what are called *Iſſues*, generally, and theſe iſſues are more or leſs, according to the quantum of the debt or demand. To come now to the caſe of a late Paymaſter. A *Diſtringas ad Computandum* was iſſued againſt him, directed to the Sheriffs of London. There being no account ſettled, or balance liquidated, the Sheriffs could only return *Iſſues*, and they returned againſt the ſame Paymaſter, iſſues to the amount of 1000l. Theſe iſſues were, in the regular courſe, carried, by the proper officer, from the Exchequer into the *Pipe*-office.

A warrant afterwards came from the Treaſury to ſtop theſe iſſues. The iſſues were taken back from the Pipe-office.

To the Printer of the GAZETTEER.

Kingſgate, July 20, 1769.

LORD HOLLAND ſeeing in your paper a letter from Mr. Beckford to a Liveryman, of July 15, 1769, and Mr. Woodhouſe being at Spa in Germany, ſends you an authentic copy of the paper, which he ſent by Mr. Woodhouſe to Mr. Beckford: he hopes the peruſal of it will convince the reader that all is falſe that can be imputed any crime to Lord Holland.

The reader will ſee, that ſome of Lord Holland's accounts were then before the auditor; and there are two years' accounts ſince lodged there.

He will ſee that Lord Holland's accounts (voluminous and difficult beyond example) have not been kept back from inclination, but neceſſity; and not longer than thoſe of his predeceſſors.

He will ſee (and is deſired to obſerve particularly) that ſavings, ſo far from remaining all in Lord Holland's hands, had been given in, and voted in aid of the public ſervice, to the amount of 910,541l. and 43,533l. 19s. 7d. (upon ſome regimental and other accounts, being adjuſted this laſt winter) have been ſince paid and voted.

He

He will read in it, that Lord Holland deſired to be ſhewn how he could proceed faſter than he did. If nobody has ſhewn, or can ſhew how that might have been, or may be done, does he deſerve either puniſhment or cenſure? And had he not a right to think himſelf ſure that Mr. Beckford muſt have been againſt the article in the petition relating to him, becauſe *Mr. Beckford knew, and could have ſhewn the Lord Mayor in writing, the utter falſehood of what is there inſinuated.*

Lord Holland prints the memorial *examined* by the Treaſury, and the ſign manual it obtained; ſtopping proceſs (not accounts) for ſix months, which neither did, nor could ſuſpend or delay the Paymaſter's accounts an hour.

HOLLAND.

Obſervations on the Accounts of the Paymaſter General.

Why were Lord Holland's *Accounts as* Paymaſter General, *for the years* 1757, 1758, *and* 1759, *not delivered to the Auditors, before the year* 1768?

Anſwer.

The Paymaſter General's officers being beſt acquainted with army accounts, are employed in making up the account of the preceding

preceding Paymaſter. The accounts of the Earls of Chatham, Darlington, and Kinnoul, and Mr. Potter, were made up by them, and regularly, and in due courſe delivered to the auditors.

Great as the army and its expences were, during the laſt war, beyond all former example, diſperſed in all quarters of the world; and difficult, as it evidently muſt have been, to keep the accounts in any tolerable order; it will be found upon examination, that the accounts of Lord Holland, as Paymaſter General, are not further back than thoſe of his predeceſſors, and that his Lordſhip's accounts are not kept back, as has been ſuggeſted, from inclination, but neceſſity.

The late Mr. Winnington's accounts, for two years and a half, from December 1743, to the 14th of June 1746, were declared the 15th of May 1760. The Earl of Chatham's accounts, for nine years and a half, from the 25th of June 1746 to the 24th of December 1755, are not yet declared. The Earls of Darlington and Kinnoul, for the year 1756, and Earl of Kinnoul's and Mr. Potter's, for ſix months, to the 24th of June 1757, are now before the auditors. The accounts of Lord Holland, for the years 1757, 1758, and 1759; likewiſe the accounts of his deputies, attending the army in Germany,

many, from the commencement to the end of the late war, are alſo before the auditors for their examination; and his Lordſhip's account for the year 1760, is almoſt ready to be delivered to them.

From the nature and extenſion of army accounts, it is moſt evident, to thoſe that are beſt acquainted with them, that it is tedious and difficult to bring even regimental accounts to a final adjuſtment; other parts of the accounts are more ſo. Lord Holland in the courſe of the years 1759, 1760, 1761, 1762, 1763, and 1764, has paid to regiments and independant companies, 320,391l. 9s. 11d.; whoſe accounts are at this time, unadjuſted, for want of proper authorities; and till thoſe authorities are obtained, the auditor will not allow one ſhilling of ſaid ſum, in his Lordſhip's accounts: to obtain thoſe authorities, his Lordſhip has often repeated his ſolicitations.

What is the Balance of Caſh in Lord Holland's *hands?*

Anſwer.

The meaning of this queſtion can be no other than, What are the ſavings in Lord Holland's hands? Or, in other words, How much has the expence, in any caſe, fallen ſhort of the ſum voted?

As to the ſavings:—So far as the pay-office has been able to ſtate the army accounts, they have been given into parliament.

From ſervices that have fallen ſhort of the ſums voted; and for monies paid in by the army accomptants, Lord Holland directed accounts to be made up and laid before the Houſe of Commons; and accordingly (out of theſe ſavings in Lord Holland's hands) parliament from time to time availed itſelf of the following ſums, viz.

	l.	*s.*	*d.*
Voted in aid of extraordinaries, to Dec. 24, 1763,	239,966	1	4
Voted in the year 1764, in aid of German claims	170,906	2	8
Voted in the year 1765, in aid of ditto ſervice, -	251,740	2	7
Voted in the year 1766, in aid of extra ſervices, -	60,638	2	10
Voted in the year 1767, in aid of extraordinaries, and other ſervices - -	171,571	13	3
Voted in the year 1768, in aid of ſupply - -	15,712	15	7
£.	910,534	18	3

His Lordſhip could by no other means aſcertain and give into parliament the ſavings on the votes for the army, but by the final adjuſtment

adjuſtment of army accounts; what further ſavings may be, is very uncertain, as they cannot be known before the ſervices are abſolutely determined and cloſed.

His Lordſhip is very ſorry to ſay it, That in the years 1759, 1760, 1761, 1762, 1763, and 1764, there are not leſs than fifty-ſix regiments and companies, now ſtanding open and unadjuſted, for want of authorities; and in his ledgers there are accounts to a much greater extent, as the pay of ſtaff-officers, &c. &c.

It may be ſeen here, that though Mr. Winnington died in April 1746, and his executor, Mr. Ingram, uſed all poſſible induſtry to cloſe his accounts, they could not be cloſed till 1760; fourteen years. The Earl of Chatham went out in December 1755; yet his accounts were not cloſed till 1768; thirteen years. The Earl of Kinnoul's are not cloſed yet, and he has been out of office eleven years. Lord Holland has been out three years and a half; Where is the wonder his are not cloſed?

If thoſe who complain, will ſhew Lord Holland how he can proceed faſter than he does, he will be very much obliged to them. Let it be obſerved, that he has before the auditors, already, accounts for more years than Mr. Winnington or Lord Kinnoul had to account for.

MEMORIAL *for Lord* Holland *to have longer time to make up his accounts, as late Paymaſter General.*

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR LORDSHIPS,

I BEG leave to inform your Lordſhips that a proceſs is in the hands of the Sheriffs of Middleſex, againſt me, to account to his Majeſty for the monies intruſted to me, as Paymaſter General of his Majeſty's forces.

I moſt humbly apprehend, that the regular ordinary courſe of accounting in the Exchequer, was calculated (when eſtabliſhed) for tranſactions at home, which are eaſily and readily to be collected, and made up at ſhort periods of time.

The accounts of the army, when employed abroad particularly, muſt unavoidably be much in arrear, from the nature of the ſervice. The army payments are neceſſarily in arrear; and articles, from accidents inevitable, are obliged often to remain open a very long time before they can finally be cloſed.

The accounts of the laſt war are voluminous and difficult beyond example. The great variety of operations, and the very great diſtance of the troops, made, and muſt make, the correſpondence, and adjuſting thoſe accounts, with the paymaſters and accountants attending them, very ſlow and tedious: Theſe therefore,

therefore, will require longer time to make up, both from their bulk and difficulty.

During the courſe of a war, the troops conſtantly changing and moving, and the ſervice in the utmoſt hurry, it cannot *then* be done with the order and regularity abſolutely neceſſary.

Since the war the utmoſt diligence has been uſed in them. The great intricate article of foreign expence, (viz. the German,) has been got together for the whole time, (which, after the former war, was ſeveral years about); and one year and an half's *General Account* is now made out, and ready to be laid before the auditors; the reſt will regularly be laid before them, as faſt as it is well poſſible to make them up. Though I have been two years out of employment, the payments for my time are not yet compleated.

I therefore pray your Lordſhips will be pleaſed to obtain his Majeſty's warrant, granting me longer time for making up my accounts as Paymaſter General of his Majeſty's forces;

Which is, &c.

Pay-Office, Horſe-Guards, June, 25th, 1767. HOLLAND.

King's

King's Warrant. Stay of Proceſs againſt Lord Holland *for ſix months.*

(COPY.)

GEORGE R.

WHEREAS Our Right Truſty and Well-beloved Henry, Lord Holland, hath, by the annexed Memorial repreſented, that from ſeveral unavoidable cauſes and difficulties he hath been prevented making up his accompts, as late Paymaſter General of Our forces: And we having taken the ſaid matter into our Royal conſideration, are graciouſly pleaſed to grant unto him a farther time for making up of his ſaid accompts. Our will and pleaſure therefore is, and We do hereby direct, authorize, and require you to cauſe all proceſs againſt the ſaid Henry, Lord Holland, for his accompts, as late Paymaſter General of Our forces, to be ſtayed, for and during the term of ſix months, computed from the day of the date hereof. And for ſo doing this ſhall be your warrant, Given at Our Court at St. James's, the eighth day of July, 1767, in the ſeventh year of Our reign.

By his Majeſty's Command,
GRAFTON,
C. TOWNSHEND,
THO. TOWNSHEND.

To Our Right Truſty and Well-beloved Samuel, Lord Marſham, Our Remembrancer in Our Court of Exchequer.

Mr.

Mr. BURKE's *Speeches at* BRISTOL.

Briſtol, October 18, 1774.

The following is Mr. Burke's Speech to the Electors of Briſtol, from the Huſtings.

'GENTLEMEN,

I am come hither to ſolicit in perſon, that favour which my friends have hitherto endeavoured to procure for me, by the moſt obliging, and to me the moſt honourable exertions.

'I have ſo high an opinion of the great truſt which you have to confer on this occaſion, and by long experience, ſo juſt a diffidence in my abilities, to fill it in a manner adequate even to my own ideas, that I ſhould never have ventured of myſelf to intrude into that awful ſituation. But ſince I am called upon by the deſire of ſeveral reſpectable fellow ſubjects, as I have done at other times, I give up my fears to their wiſhes. Whatever my other deficiencies my be, I do not know what it is to be wanting to my Friends.

'I am not fond of attempting to raiſe public expectation by great promiſes. At this time there is much cauſe to conſider, and very little to preſume. We ſeem to be approaching to a great criſis in our affairs, which

which calls for the whole wiſdom of the wiſeſt among us, without being able to aſſure ourſelves, that any wiſdom can preſerve us from many and great inconveniencies. You know I ſpeak of our unhappy conteſt with America. I confeſs it is a matter on which I look down as from a precipice. It is difficult in itſelf, and it is rendered more intricate by a great variety of plans of conduct. I do not mean to enter into them. I will not ſuſpect a want of good intention in framing them. But however pure the intentions of their authors may have been, we all know that the event has been unfortunate. The means of recovering our affairs are not obvious. So many great queſtions of commerce, of finance, of conſtitution, and of policy, are involved in this American deliberation, that I dare engage for nothing, but that I ſhall give it, without any predilection to former opinions, or any ſiniſter bias whatſoever, the honeſt and impartial conſideration of which I am capable. The public has a full right to it; and this great city, a main pillar in the commercial intereſt of Great Britain, muſt totter on its baſe by the ſlighteſt miſtake, with regard to our American meaſures. Thus much however, I think it not amiſs to lay before you: That I am not, I hope, apt to take up or lay down my opinions lightly. I have held, and ever

ſhall

ſhall maintain to the beſt of my power, unimpaired and undiminiſhed, the juſt, wiſe and neceſſary conſtitutional ſuperiority of Great Britain. This is neceſſary for America, as well as for us. I never mean to depart from it. Whatever may be loſt by it, I avow it. The forfeiture even of your favour, if by ſuch a declaration I could forfeit it, though the firſt object of my ambition, never will make me diſguiſe my ſentiments on this ſubject.

'But I have ever had a clear opinion, and have ever held a conſtant correſpondent conduct, that this ſuperiority is conſiſtent with all the liberties a ſober and ſpirited American ought to deſire. I never mean to put any coloniſt, or any human creature, in a ſituation, not becoming a free-man. To reconcile Britiſh ſuperiority with American liberty ſhall be my great object, as far as my little faculties extend. I am far from thinking that both, even yet, may not be preſerved.

'When I firſt devoted myſelf to the public ſervice, I conſidered how I ſhould render myſelf fit for it; and this I did by endeavouring to diſcover what it was, that gave this country the rank it holds in the world; I found that our proſperity and dignity aroſe principally, if not ſolely, from two ſources; our conſtitution and commerce. Both theſe I have ſpared no ſtudy to underſtand, and to endeavour to ſupport.

'The diſtinguiſhing part of our conſtitution is its liberty. To preſerve that liberty inviolate ſeems the particular duty and proper truſt of a member of the Houſe of Commons. But the liberty, the only liberty I mean, is a liberty connected with order: that not only exiſts along with order and virtue, but which cannot exiſt at all without them. It inheres in good ſteady government, as in its ſubſtance and vital principle.

The other ſource of our power is commerce, of which you are ſo large a part, and which cannot exiſt, no more than your liberty, without a connection with many virtues. It has ever been a very particular and a very favourite object of my ſtudy in its Principles, and in its details. I think many here are acquainted with the truth of what I ſay. This I know, that I have ever had my houſe open, and my poor ſervices ready for traders and manufacturers of every denomination. My favourite ambition is to have thoſe ſervices acknowledged. I now appear before you to make trial, whether my earneſt endeavours have been ſo wholly oppreſſed by the weakneſs of my abilities, as to be rendered inſignificant in the eyes of a great trading city; or whether you chuſe to give a weight to humble abilities, for the ſake of the honeſt exertions with which they are accompanied. This is my trial to-day. My induſtry is not on trial; of my induſtry I am ſure, as far as my conſtitution of mind and body admitted.

'When I was invited by many reſpectable merchants, freeholders, and freemen of this city, to offer them my ſervices, I had juſt received the honour of an election at another place, at a very great diſtance from this. I immediately opened the matter to thoſe of my worthy conſtituents, who were with me, and they unanimouſly adviſed me not to decline it; that they had elected me with a view to the public ſervice; and that as great queſtions relative to our commerce and colonies were imminent, that in ſuch matters I might derive authority and ſupport from the repreſentation of this great commercial city; they deſired me therefore to ſet off without delay, very well perſuaded that I never could forget my obligations to them, or to my friends for the choice they had made of me. From that time to this inſtant I have not ſlept, and if I ſhould have the honour of being freely choſen by you, I hope I ſhall be as far from ſlumbering or ſleeping when your ſervice requires me to be awake, as I have been in coming to offer myſelf a candidate for your favour.'

To the Gentlemen, Clergy, Freeholders and Freemen of the City of Briſtol.

GENTLEMEN,

I HUMBLY requeſt your acceptance of my moſt hearty thanks for the high honour I have

I have this day received, in being elected one of your Repreſentatives in Parliament.

Whatever advantage my public character may derive from the weight of ſo reſpectable a repreſentation, you may be aſſured, ſhall be employed in promoting to the beſt of my judgment, the true intereſts of thoſe from whom it is derived. I hope, that, by your frequent advice and ſeaſonable aſſiſtance, I may be enabled to execute the great truſt you have repoſed in me, in a manner in ſome degree equal to its importance and your wiſhes.

To my particular friends I owe the ſincereſt affection; to this city the moſt inviolable duty; to the Sheriffs, who preſided, my full teſtimony, that they have conducted themſelves, through the whole of this long election, with the moſt liberal impartiality; with all the dignity of magiſtrates; with all the politeneſs of gentlemen.

It is natural, that an object, ſo important as the honour of repreſenting this great city, ſhould not be abandoned without reluctance. The Gentleman, who has been unſucceſsful in his purſuit, threatens a petition. I ſubmit, with great chearfulneſs, my pretenſions, and, what are more important, your rights, to the committee of election; the cleareſt cauſe to the juſteſt tribunal. That tribunal, I am confident, will never authoriſe an attempt to render, contrary to the clear and expreſs

expreſs law of the land, the original, inherent, corporate rights of thoſe entitled to freedom in this great city, dependent, for their valid exerciſe, on the occaſional pleaſure of a Miniſter, by dating their effect from the iſſuing of the writ. 'The time for iſſuing the writ is entirely in the power of the Miniſter; and he may communicate his intentions to thoſe, and thoſe only, whom he is inclined to favour; and upon this new doctrine enable them, and diſable all others, from taking advantage of the right of freedom.

No care of mine ſhall be wanting to ſupport the rights even of thoſe freemen whom the gentleman who threatens a petition, was the firſt to produce and encourage, and when they can no longer ſerve his purpoſe, now endeavours to disfranchiſe by a retroſpect.

I have the honour to be, with the higheſt veneration, eſteem, and gratitude, Gentlemen, your moſt obedient, and ever obliged humble ſervant,

Briſtol, Nov. 3, 1774. EDMUND BURKE.

To the Gentlemen, Clergy, Freeholders, and Freemen of the City of Briſtol.

GENTLEMEN,

MY general conduct in Parliament, and my humble endeavours to ſerve the city, and the citizens of Briſtol in their particular affairs, having been honoured by the unani-

mous approbation of a very large and very reſpectable meeting at the Guildhall this day; in conformity with the deſire of that meeting, and under the ſanction of their weighty authority, I beg leave to renew to you my humble ſolicitation for your votes at this election, and the favour of your early appearance at the poll on Friday next; and if I have the honour of being again choſen to repreſent you, I truſt that I ſhall not ſhew myſelf leſs deſerving of your favour than formerly, or leſs ſincerely grateful for it.

I have the honour to be, with the moſt perfect reſpect and eſteem, Gentlemen, your moſt obedient and moſt obliged ſervant,

Briſtol, Sept. 6, 1780. EDMUND BURKE.

Mr. BURKE *made the following ſpeech on the huſtings at Briſtol when he declined the poll:*

"GENTLEMEN,

"I DECLINE the election. It has ever been my rule through life, to obſerve a proportion between my efforts and my objects. I have never been remarkable for a bold, active, and ſanguine purſuit of advantages that are perſonal to myſelf.

"I have not canvaſſed the whole of this city in form. But I have taken ſuch a view of it, as ſatisfies my own mind, that your choice will not ultimately fall upon me.

Your

Your city, gentlemen, is in a ſtate of miſerable diſtraction: and I am reſolved to withdraw whatever ſhare my pretenſions may have had in its unhappy diviſions. I have not been in haſte; I have tried all prudent means; I have waited for the effect of all contingencies. If I were fond of a conteſt, by the partiality of my numerous friends (whom ye know to be among the moſt weighty and reſpectable people of the city) I have the means of a ſharp one in my hands. But I thought it far better, with my ſtrength unſpent, and my reputation unimpaired, to do, early and from foreſight, that which I might be obliged to do from neceſſity at laſt.

"I am not in the leaſt ſurprized, nor in the leaſt angry at this view of things. I have read the book of life for a long time, and I have read other books a little. Nothing has happened to me but what has happened to men much better than me, and in times and in nations full as good as the age and country that we live in. To ſay that I am no way concerned, would be neither decent nor true. The repreſentation of Briſtol was an object on many accounts dear to me; and I certainly ſhould very far prefer it to any other in the kingdom. My habits are made to it; and it is in general more unpleaſant to be rejected, after long trial, than not to be choſen at all.

"But, gentlemen, I will ſee nothing except your

your former kindneſs, and I will give way to no other ſentiments than thoſe of gratitude. From the bottom of my heart I thank you for what you have done for me. You have given me a long term, which is now expired. I have performed the conditions, and enjoyed all the profits to the full; and I now ſurrender your eſtate into your hands, without being, in a ſingle tile, or a ſingle ſtone, impaired or waſted by my uſe. I have ſerved the public for fifteen years. I have ſerved you in particular for ſix. What is paſſed is well ſtored. It is ſafe and out of the power of fortune. What is to come is in wiſer hands than ours; and he, in whoſe hands it is, beſt knows whether it is beſt for you and me, that I ſhould be in Parliament, or even in the world.

"Gentlemen, the melancholy event of yeſterday reads to us an awful leſſon againſt being too much troubled about any of the objects of ordinary ambition. The worthy gentleman, (Mr. Combe,) who has been ſnatched from us at the moment of the election, and in the middle of the conteſt, whilſt his deſires were as warm, and his hopes as eager as ours, has feelingly told us, what ſhadows we are, and what ſhadows we purſue.

"It has been uſual for a candidate who declines, to take his leave by a letter to the Sheriffs; but I received your truſt in the face of day, and in the face of day I accept your diſmiſſion.

diſmiſſion. I am not—I am not at all aſhamed to look upon you: nor can my preſence diſcompoſe the order of buſineſs here. I humbly and reſpectfully take my leave of the Sheriffs, the candidates, and the electors, wiſhing heartily that the choice may be for the beſt, at a time which calls, if ever time did call, for ſervice that is not nominal. It is no plaything you are about. I tremble when I conſider the truſt I have preſumed to aſk. I confided perhaps too much in my intentions. They were really fair and upright; and I am bold to ſay, that I aſk no ill thing for you, when, on parting from this place, I pray, that whoever you chooſe to ſucceed me, may reſemble me exactly in all things, except in my abilities to ſerve, and my fortune to pleaſe you."

To the Gentlemen, Clergy, Freeholders, and Freemen of the City of Briſtol.

GENTLEMEN, *Briſtol, Sept.* 9, 1780.

A VERY large and moſt reſpectable meeting of the principal citizens of Briſtol did, by an unanimous vote, authoriſe me to offer myſelf once more to your ſervice. My deference to that authority was my ſole motive for giving you one moment's trouble. On my canvaſs, ſo far as it has proceeded, I found that my pretenſions were well received, and even with a degree of warmth in many of the electors.

But on a calm and very deliberate view of the ſtate of the city, I am convinced that no other conſequence can be reaſonably expected from my continuing a candidate, than a long, vexatious, and expenſive conteſt. Conſcious, that no difference between my ſervice and that of any other man, can be worth the inconveniencies of ſuch a ſtruggle, I decline the election.

I return you my beſt thanks for having at any time, or for any period, condeſcended to think of me for your repreſentative. I have done my duty towards you, and towards the nation, as became me. You diſpoſe of the future truſt (as you have a right to do) according to your diſcretion. We have no cauſe of complaint on either ſide. By being returned into the maſs of private citizens, my burthens are leſſened, my ſatisfactions are not deſtroyed. There are duties to be performed, and there are comforts to be enjoyed in obſcurity, for which I am not without a diſpoſition and reliſh. I am ſure there is nothing in the retroſpect of my public conduct, which is likely to diſturb the tranquillity of that ſituation, to which you reſtore me.

I have the honour to be, with the utmoſt poſſible reſpect, gentlemen, your much obliged, and moſt obedient humble ſervant,

EDMUND BURKE.

FINIS.